The AMERICAN PUBLIC MIND

Odegard

SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY 11384630
he American public mind,
169.1023
3 2911 00738236 9

SYRACUSE
UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY
SUOS CULTORES SCIENTIA CORONAT
FOUNDED A.D. 1870

FROM THE LIBRARY OF
HERMAN C. BEYLE

E
169
.1
023
c.3

DATE DUE

The American Public Mind

The American Public Mind

BY

PETER ODEGARD
PROFESSOR OF POLITICAL SCIENCE
OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

NEW YORK
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS
1930

Copyright 1930
Columbia University Press

Published October, 1930

Printed in the United States of America
The Torch Press, Cedar Rapids, Iowa

TO
ELEANOR AND SIGURD

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/bwb_W9-DGZ-778

PREFACE

Why do we behave like Americans? Whence come our ideas and ideals? What are the forces which mold our minds? Is the family bankrupt, the Church decrepit? Who controls our schools, and what do they teach? What newspapers and books do we read, and how do they influence our behavior? Are the movies and the radio enervating or elevating? Do our political parties adequately represent our opinions on public questions? If not, why do they endure? What function, if any, do lobbyists perform? Are we helpless victims of high-pressure advertising and propaganda? Is there an American Public Mind, and where is it to be found? These are questions which the following pages attempt in part to answer.

"The private citizen today has come to feel rather like a deaf spectator in the back row," says Walter Lippmann. "[Public affairs] are managed, if they are managed at all, at distant centers, from behind the scenes, by unnamed powers." What are these powers, and whose are the invisible hands pulling the strings which make the puppet public dance?

There has been an excess of laudation and lampooning of the public. It is a far cry from Aristotle's belief in the divine wisdom of collective humanity to the cruel cynicism of George Moore, who assures us that "Humanity is a pigsty, where liars, hypocrites, and the obscene in spirit congregate." Public opinion has been called the "voice of

God" by romantic democrats and "the muttering of a great beast" by self-styled aristocrats. Obviously it is neither. Nor is it a disembodied spirit which mysteriously governs in a democracy. It can be heard, its influence can be seen, and it can be understood. Public opinion is not a phantom and it should not be made a fetish.

Numerous writers have discussed this problem, and to them the author is heavily indebted. The careful reading of the manuscript by Professor Samuel Allen of Williams College, has added much to its clarity; and without the material made available by many individuals and organizations, the book would have been impossible. The author, of course, takes full responsibility for whatever opinions are expressed.

PETER ODEGARD

WILLIAMSTOWN, MASSACHUSETTS
June, 1930

CONTENTS

I. The Foundations of Personality . . 1

II. Social Behavior 27

III. The Pillars of Society: The Family and the Church 47

IV. The Pillars of Society: The School . 77

V. The Fourth Estate 114

VI. Political Parties and the Popular Will 139

VII. Pressure and Propaganda . . . 166

VIII. The Arts and the Audience . . . 198

IX. Censorship and Democracy . . . 248

Bibliography 280

Index 293

Chapter I

THE FOUNDATIONS OF PERSONALITY

Public Opinion consists of the attitudes which we as individuals assume "toward those features of the world outside which have to do with the behavior of other human beings in so far as that behavior crosses ours, is dependent on us, or is interesting to us." The public being but a congeries of individuals, the forces which mold individual character are, in final analysis, those which make public opinion.

Superficially all men are pretty much alike. They walk upright, they have ten fingers and ten toes, two eyes, two ears, a nose, heart, lungs, digestive and eliminative equipment, a complicated nervous system, and what philosophers are pleased to call a mind. But in spite of these likenesses people differ widely in appearance and behavior. It may be said of men, as of leaves, that no two are exactly alike. Some are dark, some blonde, some tall, some short, some are devout Christians, others are Buddhists, while some seem to get along with no god at all. Some rule and others obey; there are leaders and the led.

Numerous theories have been offered to account for these differences. Since man left his arboreal habitat and learned the art of reflection, he has been concerned with the problem of "why we behave like human beings."

John Locke, toward the end of the seventeenth century, believed that a newborn child was like a blank page, a *tabula*

rasa, upon which environment wrote its will. The original nature of the individual was as wax to be molded by the external world. "Let us suppose the mind to be, as we say, white paper, void of all characters, without any ideas: how comes it to be furnished? . . . To this I answer in one word, from Experience. In that all our knowledge is founded and from that it ultimately derives itself."

Sensation, said Locke, was the basis of all experience, and experience the father of all thought. With proper education a child could be made into a prince or a pauper, a philosopher or a poltroon, doctor, lawyer, merchant, chief. Heredity counted for little or nothing; environment was all. No longer were the sins of the father to be visited upon the children. All men were born free and equal. Each life was a clean sheet. Given the right kind of environment, said Locke's followers, we could produce nations of Newtons and Shaksperes.

"The vices of a people are rooted in its laws," said Helvetius. "'Tis only by good laws that you can make virtuous men."

The ultra-romantic Rousseau took as his model the so-called natural man. In the beginning all men were equal and all were good. The origin of inequality he found in the customs and institutions of civilized society. Man is born free, and environment fashions his chains.

But the idyl of Rosseau and Locke was shattered when men began to examine the laws of heredity. The researches of Lamarck, Mendel, and others seemed to prove that man could not shake off the shackles of the past. Experience had writ large man's strivings and achievements, his frustrations and failures, into the very fabric of his soul. The peculiar traits which distinguish individuals one from the other were

said to be embodied in unit characters passed down from parents to offspring. Each newborn child was but a "chip of the old block." No stream could rise higher than its source: the character of the child was regarded as but a reflection of the personalities of its parents. The content of the germ cell became the measure of the man.

Customs and institutions were the *effects*, not the *causes*, of inequality. If there was a villain in the pageant of humanity, it was nature, not nurture. There were hereditary sheep and goats. Upon the shoulders of the biologically superior rested the burden of civilization. If you would be in the vanguard, pick your parents with care.

"A man's natural abilities," said Sir Francis Galton, "are derived by inheritance." Able fathers were said to produce able children, and inferiors begat inferiors. Galton asserted confidently that specific abilities were inherited. Great musicians, mathematicians, judges, statesmen, and philosophers breed others of their kind, and slaves produce slaves in a never ending stream. Since there were more of the latter than of the former, there seemed to be a Malthusian law of slavery. To produce great men by education or to raise the level of the mass by such means was absurd. It was like trying to raise society by its own boot straps. The laws of heredity are not so easily set aside. Away with the romanticism of Rousseau, Locke, and Helvetius! As the twig is bent so is the tree inclined, and the human twig is bent in the germ cell.

Karl Pearson demonstrated statistically that great men have great sons, and inferior men inferior sons. Havelock Ellis made a study of British men of genius. He found that the upper and professional classes of England, although constituting but 4.46 per cent of the population, produced

63 per cent of the men of genius. The laboring classes, with 84 per cent of the population, brought forth only 11.7 per cent of the great men. Similar studies made by Dr. Fritz Maas in Germany and by Professor J. M. Cattell and Dr. S. Visher in America gave like results. The intelligence tests made during the World War showed that almost half the population of the United States had the mental capacity of twelve-year-olds. According to the hereditarists, they and their offspring are doomed to remain subnormal forever. These inferior classes, they said, must be held in check lest a flood of degenerate sperm drag down the temple of civilization. If American civilization is to advance, we must encourage superior persons to multiply.

This eugenics cult has many monitors. A. E. Wiggam (*The Fruit of the Family Tree*) and Professor William McDougall (*Is America Safe for Democracy?*) do not hesitate to demand an elaborate eugenics program. They would sterilize the inferiors and pay bonuses to supermen who breed. Upon the ruins of democracy they would erect a hierarchy of castes. They would make the nation a sort of human stock farm where Brahmins alone would breed freely. Intermarriage between these biologic castes would be prohibited. To the "superior persons" would be the power and the glory forevermore.

The hereditarists receive aid and comfort from the racialists. As in the case of individuals, there are said to be superior and inferior races. Human inequality has its roots in racial differences. The cry of injustice is but the wail of the biologically inferior to the rule of the super-race. Slavery is the result of bad blood, not environment. The child of a Negro, a Mongol, or a Jew, they regard as congenitally inferior to a German, an Englishman, or a Swede. Accord-

ing to Gobineau, racial "problems dominate all other problems of history." The hereditary inequality of races and individuals is "sufficient to explain the entire enchainment of the destinies of peoples." All social and political behavior is the result of racial traits. Civilization and barbarism are bred in the bone.

The disciples of Gobineau are legion. Today his doctrines are broadcast by such popular writers as Lothrop Stoddard, Madison Grant, Henry F. Osborn, and William McDougall. His theories are incorporated by innuendo into our immigration laws. The yellow race we exclude, the Latins we have ceased to welcome, and the Jew is the hobgoblin of every Nordic's nightmare. The Negro, unfortunately, we have with us; our task, they say, is to teach him his place and keep him in it. The Knights of the Ku Klux Klan are the devoted followers of Gobineau. The magic of the hood and sheet resides in the belief that God is a Nordic and the hooded hoodlums are his prophets. Jews, Latins, Slavs, and Negroes must be rigorously ruled or civilization will perish before "the rising tide of color."

These thinkers are impatient with all talk of human equality. According to Karl Pearson the Aryan race is so demonstrably superior that the white man "should go and completely drive out the inferior race." Again he says, "You may hope for a time when the white man and the dark shall share the soil between them, and each till as he lists. But, believe me, when that day comes mankind will no longer progress; there will be nothing to check the fertility of the inferior stock; the relentless law of heredity will not be controlled and guided by natural selection. Man will stagnate and . . . catastrophe will come again."

Coupled with the doctrine of heredity is that of instinct.

To the instinctivist the complicated problems of human behavior are to be explained in terms of inherited behavior patterns. The newborn child is not a blank page. He comes into the world with an elaborate set of instincts which inexorably determine the channels in which his life must flow. There is scarcely an act of either man or beast which has not at some time been dubbed an instinct. There are instincts of fear, of courage, and of conquest; of assertion and subjection; of love and hate. Professor L. L. Bernard in his recent study *Instinct* lists a total of 849 general groups of instincts made by 250 authors in 259 books. These groups include 1,549 specific instincts ranging from sex to spinning. There are 51 aesthetic instincts, 44 altruistic, 100 antisocial, 60 economic, 27 ethical, 83 family, 64 food-getting, 149 gregarious and social, and 106 intellectual instincts.

It is delightfully simple to say that men fight because of an instinct of pugnacity. They have families because of the instincts of sex and parental affection. They worship God because of an instinct of reverence. Why do some men rule and others obey? Instincts of assertion and subjection. Why do some give up all they have and others seem never to have enough? Instincts of altruism and acquisition. Even stealing has been attributed to the instinct of kleptomania. To this school, instinct becomes the *deus ex machina* of psychology.

But all men do not behave alike; and an instinct, by definition, is an innate tendency "common to the men of every race and of every age." This presents no difficulty to the instinctivist. Differences in behavior, he says, are due to the dominance of different instincts in different individuals. Then too, although instincts cannot be created or destroyed, they can be modified and controlled. Thus the instinct to kill may

be controlled by the instinct of humanitarianism, the instinct to destroy by the instinct to conserve. The perplexities of varying personalities are solved by a system of psychological checks and balances. Instinctive drives, they say, may be consciously controlled. In fact, the whole of conscious life is organized in the service of the instincts. Mind is but the handmaiden to prepotent reflex drives. To the degree that we are able to put on leash the antisocial and release the social instincts we become civilized.

How does the instinctivist discover these instincts? How separate the unlearned from the learned? One eminent psychologist sent questionnaires to 787 persons asking them what things they feared, loved, hated, and so forth. When the replies came in, he merely struck the lowest common denominator and called it an instinct. Most of the people questioned admitted an early and enduring fear of snakes — *ergo*, there must be an instinct to fear snakes. They loved their parents and children, hence the instinct of filial devotion and parental affection. A goodly number confessed to having run away from home at an early age — obviously due to an instinct of wandering or waywardness. William James suggested that instinctive behavior might be denominated behavior which required no justification. Whatever was self-evident was instinctive. But such an hypothesis is fraught with possibilities of error. What seems self-evident to me may be anything but self-evident to you. To a young cannibal it seems self-evident that he should eat the body of his slain enemy; certainly such conduct is not self-evident to a Christian.

Since human beings are not guinea pigs, it has been difficult to subject human behavior to laboratory observation.

Until recent years psychologists have been, for the most part, of the armchair variety or have concerned themselves with the study of animal behavior. The former method, called introspection, has given us many valuable hunches. But since the introspectionist, like other persons, is biased in his own behalf, he runs great danger of confusing his prejudices and his superstitions with his science. If we ask Peter his opinion of Paul, we may learn a great deal about Peter but very little of scientific value about Paul.

The study of animals is, of course, more likely to give reliable results, since it may be more or less objective. There is, however, considerable danger in generalizing concerning human beings from our observations of white rats and monkeys. Men are men, not kangaroos. As H. S. Jennings remarks, "How correctly could I predict the behavior and social organization of ants from a knowledge of the natural history of the oyster?"

Of late years there has been a rather decided swing away from the easy generalizations of the hereditarists, racialists, and instinctivists. The work of Boas, Lowie, Dorsey, Goldenweiser, and others in the field of anthropology has thrown considerable doubt upon the conclusions of Gobineau and his followers. While there are undoubtedly differences between white men and Mongols, between Negroes and Nordics, they are mainly physical rather than psychological and are due more to environment than to heredity, except in so far as psychological traits may depend upon physical structure. There are few if any data to justify the terms *superior* and *inferior* in speaking of the races of man. In his classic treatment of *The Mind of Primitive Man* Professor Boas writes: "There is nothing to prove that licen-

tiousness, shiftless laziness, lack of initiative, are fundamental characteristics of the [Negro] race. Everything points out that these qualities are the result of social conditions rather than hereditary traits. . . . In short, there is every reason to believe that the Negro, when given facility and opportunity, will be perfectly able to fulfill the duties of citizenship as well as his white neighbor."

Modern geneticists such as T. H. Morgan, Raymond Pearl, and H. S. Jennings express grave doubts concerning the claims of the eugenics cult. Upon one thing they are agreed: heredity and its laws are filled with imponderable mysteries, and the dogmas of Wiggam, McDougall, and their school are almost wholly unjustified. Like does not produce like. To predict with any accuracy the character of offspring from a particular union would require more information than we at present possess. Pearl has studied geniuses, their fathers, and their children. His results are disastrous to the notion that eminence is congenital. Of the fathers of sixty-three eminent philosophers mentioned in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, "just two were sufficiently distinguished to leave public record of that fact." Of the philosophers themselves, "five only . . . produced children who were either gifted or distinguished." Eighty-five great poets were studied. The fathers of only three of them "achieved sufficient distinction to get separate mention in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*." It is interesting to note that only two of the poets were sons of poets; whereas eight of them were children of farmers or peasants, and eleven were sons of merchants, tradesmen, or petty shopkeepers.

Even though we were able to control the breeding of men as we do of cattle, there would still remain the difficult prob-

lem of deciding which type of individual should be permitted to procreate. One shudders at the thought of a eugenics board controlled by the Ku Klux Klan.

It should be unnecessary to remark that the studies of Galton, Ellis, Maas, and Cattell prove almost nothing concerning the relative importance of heredity and environment. Suppose it is true that great men come, in a greater number of cases, from the upper social and economic classes. Is this due to a more favorable environment or better blood? We need no biologist or biometrician to tell us that the chances of a child becoming a scholar are greatly improved if he is raised in an atmosphere where scholarship is pursued and respected. To say that great writers produce more great writers than do blacksmiths is to assert precisely nothing concerning heredity. A similar study would no doubt show that able blacksmiths produce good blacksmiths in greater proportion than do great authors.

Few of these studies have extended over long enough periods to prove much. The statistics would have more value if they included not one or two but a dozen generations. A simple illustration will show the dangers inherent in generalizing from such results as have been obtained. Robert Todd Lincoln was an eminent American. Investigation shows that his father was a great man. Therefore, say the hereditarists, great men breed true. But the parents of Abraham Lincoln were Tom Lincoln and Nancy Hanks, who, from all accounts, were not great. Is there any assurance that in five generations the descendants of Robert Todd Lincoln will even figure in *Who's Who*? Then too, is the greatness due to the Lincoln blood or the Hanks and Todd blood? It is a most perplexing question. Man has been

more successful in controlling his environment than his heredity — his geography than his gene. In spite of those who have abandoned the laboratory for the lyceum, we are not yet ready for the human stock-farm experiment. We know too little. Professor T. H. Morgan in his book *Evolution and Genetics* says that "within each human social group the geneticist finds it impossible to discover, with any reasonable certainty, the genetic basis of behavior."

Much light could undoubtedly be thrown upon the bases of human behavior from a study of the prenatal influences upon the individual. Most of our studies go back only to parturition and few go that far. The influences of environment begin at conception. Toxic conditions in the mother, the position and shape of the womb, thermal, electrical, and chemical conditions affect the developing embryo. They must be taken into account if we are fully to understand the foundations of human personality.

Our squeamishness at subjecting human beings to laboratory observation has been in part overcome, and psychologists are abandoning the armchair for the clinic. Those who hold the center of the psychological stage at the present writing style themselves *behaviorists*. They find no need for an elaborate set of instincts. "The behaviorist," says Watson, "finds that the human being at birth is a very lowly piece of unformed protoplasm, ready to be shaped by any family in whose care it is first placed. This piece of protoplasm breathes, makes babbling, gurgling, cooing sounds with its vocal mechanisms, slaps its arms and legs about . . . cries, excretes through the skin and other organs waste matter from its food. In short, it squirms (*responds*) when environment (inside or out) attacks it (*stimulates it*). This

is the solid observational rock upon which the behaviorist's view is founded."

Human behavior is to be explained in terms of stimulus and response. Environment is again enthroned, heredity is forced into the background or ruled out altogether, reason vanishes or becomes merely the organization of complex reflexes induced by word symbols. The stream of behavior is substituted for the stream of consciousness. Our equipment at birth is physiological — we have no psychological impedimenta. Man is a physicochemical organism which takes in food and transforms it into energy — nothing more. He is active and sensitive to stimuli; he has no inborn fears or phobias. Certain basic human needs, such as food, sex-relief, light, air, sunshine, are universal. But the ways in which these needs are satisfied vary almost infinitely. "What a man shall eat," says Professor Randall, "how often, how much, under what circumstances, with what ceremonies . . . are all part of the social habits learned by the child. With whom and with how many a man shall satisfy his sexual urges, on what conditions, after what rites, for how long, and even, if recent psychological experiments may be trusted, with which sex, are all parts of a particular culture." They are *learned*, not *instinctive* responses.

The methodology of the behaviorist consists of observation and measurement. He is more interested in the way Peter behaves than in the reasons he gives for his behavior. These psychologists study the child in the laboratory, subject him to various stimuli, and watch his reactions. The behaviorist laments the fact that "no well-trained man or woman has ever watched the complete and daily development of a single child from its birth to its third year" and

asserts blandly that "no one today knows enough to raise a child."

The key which the behaviorist offers to unlock the secrets of the human soul is the *conditioned response.* We learn — that is to say, we react to new situations and stimuli in particular ways because they are associated with old and familiar stimuli. One or two simple illustrations will show the mechanism of the conditioned response. Take a dog into the laboratory. "A small opening is made to lead from the [salivary] gland to the external surface of the cheek, and a small tube is cemented to this outlet. . . . This tube is made to connect with an apparatus which records automatically the number of drops that flow from the gland. The animal is isolated from the experimenter and from any auditory, olfactory, visual, or other stimuli not controlled by the investigator." Now if food or acid is introduced into the dog's mouth, a flow of saliva results. This is an unlearned, unconditioned stimulus to the salivary gland. Other stimuli, such as the ringing of a bell, appear to have no effect upon the gland. Suppose, however, that each time food is introduced the bell is rung simultaneously. After a few repetitions it will be seen that the salival flow may be induced by the simple ringing of the bell, even though no food is present. The bell has become the substituted or conditioned stimulus for that particular response.

At Johns Hopkins University similar experiments have been performed with children. Take a healthy nine-months-old baby. Place a rabbit beside him. He has never seen a rabbit before, but he reaches for it the moment his eyes light upon it. Replace the rabbit with a pigeon, frog, or snake. The baby displays no fear whatever. The young boa con-

strictor becomes his playmate and buddy. Now take the same baby. Hold a steel bar just behind him and strike it sharply with a hammer. Immediately fear reactions appear: he whimpers, catches his breath, his body stiffens, he begins to howl. Bang the bar again and the infant is thrown into a paroxysm of fear. A sudden loud noise is an unlearned, unconditioned stimulus to fear. How does he learn to fear other things? I quote from Watson's account of his experiments.

"Again I put in front of you the nine-months-old infant. I have my assistant take his old playmate, the rabbit, out of its pasteboard box and hand it to him. He starts to reach for it. But just as his hands touch it I bang the steel bar behind his head. He whimpers and crys and shows fear." Wait until the baby is quiet again. Now introduce the rabbit, and as he reaches for it, strike the iron bar. Again a fear response. Repeat this once more. This time a great change has taken place. It is no longer necessary to bang the bar to get the fear response. The mere sight of the rabbit fills the baby with terror. He has been "conditioned" to fear rabbits, and this fear will persist unless removed by similar methods. It will even extend to other furry objects, such as a dog, a cat, or a fur muff. Now by associating the rabbit or other furry objects with other things or persons it is possible to "condition" the baby to fear them also. Thus he may be "conditioned" to fear any person who wears a fur collar or a beard.

These conditioned responses form the building blocks of human personality. At birth all people are psychologically alike. The Negro, Jewish, or Nordic baby, whether the son of a dustman or of a duke, will behave in the same way.

Since the very essence of life is activity, human beings, like other animals, resent restraint. Hold a baby's head, his arms, or his legs, and he will display anger. In time this unlearned response becomes associated with persons and situations which restrain, or threaten to restrain, his movements. Frustration, real or imaginary, is the foundation of animosity.

Hundreds of illustrations of "conditioning" will occur to anyone who gives a moment's consideration to analyzing his own behavior. The present writer cannot endure the odor of lilacs. This is probably due to the fact that at the only funeral he ever attended, that of a very dear friend, the casket was covered with lilacs. Our likes and dislikes, fears, hopes, and hates are the result of just such associations.

Our habits are formed in pretty much the same way, and habit is the flywheel of civilization. A man is known by the habits he has. They govern the major portion of life. Eating, loving, worshiping God, all are carried on in accordance with definite habit patterns. Without habits, life would be an impossible chaos. The repetition of a stimulus and the recurrence of a response establish nervous reflexes which in time become automatic and govern our ways of behavior. The more intense the stimulus, the less need there will be for repetition. Learning to play the piano, to add, subtract, and multiply, to ride a bicycle, to take off one's hat when the flag is passing by, to vote the Republican ticket, are all habits formed by a process of "conditioning."

Armed with the mechanism of the conditioned response, the behaviorist sets no limits on his ability to mold human character. "Give me the baby," says Watson, "and my world to bring it up in and I'll make it crawl and walk; I'll

make it climb and use its hands in constructing buildings of stone or wood; I'll make it a thief, a gunman, or a dope fiend. The possibility of shaping it in any direction is almost endless." Is it any wonder that James Truslow Adams asks concerning Watson, "On what has this our Caesar fed that he has grown so great?" It is unnecessary to take these rhapsodical pronouncements as gospel to admit that the behaviorist seems to be on the right track.

A necessary correction to the behaviorist point of view has been recently offered by the German psychologists of the *Gestalt* school. Their experiments tend to show that men and animals respond, not to simple stimuli with simple responses, but respond rather to entire situations and with the whole body. It is the *relation* which persons and things bear to each other that causes us to respond and not any isolated stimulus as such. We are, so to speak, configurating animals. This notion renders the mechanism of the conditioned response more complex but does not seriously affect its essential validity.

But man not only *behaves*, he *thinks*. Descartes summed up the whole of man's existence in the phrase, *cogito, ergo sum* — "I think, therefore I am." How does the behaviorist explain thought? He regards it as merely another form of behavior. It is a physiological or neural response induced by word symbols rather than physical objects. We form word habits exactly as we form muscular habits. Words are merely substitutes for things. Thus the word *rabbit* comes, through a process of conditioning, to stand for the living animal and may ultimately induce the same response in the individual as the rabbit itself. When the individual has learned to use words, he lives in two worlds, one of symbols

and another of physical objects. "Man is the only animal who has these two worlds. He is the only animal who takes his environment to bed with him in the form of word substitutes." Without language we could not "think," and it is not unfair to say that our capacity for reason varies roughly with our vocabulary. Few persons have as many as twenty thousand words at their command, most people get along with less than two thousand, and many employ not over a few hundred.

Words have meaning when they stand for definite objects or experiences. The words *truth, good,* and *beautiful* have only vague meanings until applied to particular situations or things. A life rich in experience gives a color to language which the cloistered hermit does not share. To one who has never tasted salt, the word can have only a vague and uncertain meaning. Thus the word *star* will have a significance to the astronomer which the layman cannot appreciate. False associations, shibboleths, and catch phrases are characteristic of isolated individuals and groups. Since we are all more or less limited in our experiences, we are all subject to this form of thought.

Since our experiences vary, we attach different meanings to the same words. To a member of the Communist party the word *Bolshevik* will mean one thing, to a member of the Union League Club or the Daughters of the American Revolution it will mean something quite different. Words become convenient instruments for social intercourse to the degree that they are common symbols for common experiences. "The problem of the acquisition of meaning by things," says John Dewey, ". . . is thus the problem of introducing (1) definiteness and distinction and (2) con-

sistency or stability into what is otherwise vague and wavering."

Thinking itself, say the behaviorists, is literally a talking to oneself. "The simplest form of thinking can be seen in the three-year-old child. . . . He may have two hundred words in his repertoire. He has been conditioned upon sentences as well as upon words. He opens his eyes. There is no one in the room. He calls 'mamma,' 'nurse,' 'dada,' 'doll,' etc. He runs over his repertoire of words and sentences: 'Billy wants breakfast,' 'Billy going bye-bye.' As he grows older, the outspoken verbal responses become more complex. Parents are eager to have him talk. *He talks aloud incessantly even when no one is around.* As the family becomes assured that he is not an idiot, not dumb, they get a bit weary of so much babbling. They cry out, 'Keep quiet' (reinforcing it sometimes with a tiny spank): thereafter the child mumbles to himself. We still hear him — he disturbs our smooth-running life. Again we say, 'For heaven's sake stop mumbling to yourself.' Mumbling gives place to lip and mouth responses — silent mumbling. We can't hear this, but we see it. We socialize him still farther — 'Can't you stop moving your lips when you read and think?' Complete socialization next occurs. *The child goes on speaking, but now he really talks to himself. There is inward verbalization.*" The child has learned to think without giving any outward sign, but the muscular reactions in throat and larynx continue. "Thought then," says Watson, "is a form of general bodily activity just as simple (or just as complex) as tennis playing. The only difference is that we use the muscles of our throat, larynx, and chest instead of the muscles of our arms, legs, and trunk." (See *The Ways of Behaviorism*, Harper, 1928.)

It has been the fashion to distinguish between mind and matter, between reason and emotion. The modern psychologist will have none of this. The mind is not a disembodied essence but part and parcel of the body. When we react to a stimulus, we respond with the entire body. As Kempf says, "In simple terms, we feel and desire with our viscera, think with our muscles, and are conscious with our whole body." It has been a common observation that healthy minds and healthy bodies go together. *Mens sana in corpore sano* has long been a slogan. Continued constipation may result in chronic mental melancholy. Too much alcohol in the body will literally destroy the "mind" by anaesthetizing the nervous system. A bit of bad news may upset the digestive process, and a bad digestion may clothe the whole world in gloom. A person with high blood pressure will have a different outlook on life and will behave differently from one with low blood pressure. Tuberculosis may so affect the "mental" life as to cause insanity.

Recent researches into the functioning of the ductless glands have thrown considerable light upon the physiological foundations of personality. These glands deposit their secretions, called hormones, directly into the blood. They have been called the internal combustion engines of the mind. If the thyroid gland, located in the neck, is removed, the individual becomes phlegmatic, dull, fat; his hair falls out, his skin becomes cool and dry, and he develops into a hopeless cretin. If the gland is overactive or enlarged, it will produce extreme sensitiveness and rapid growth and will make the individual prone to hysteria. Many children suffering from cretinism and regarded by the world as idiots can be restored to mental and physical vigor if fed thyroid extract.

The pituitary gland "is a lump of tissue about the size of

a pea lying at the base of the brain." Too much pituitrin in the blood will result in giantism and hypermasculinity. Such a person will be aggressive, precocious, calculating, and self-contained. He will be less likely to suffer from a sense of inferiority. Where the secretions from the pituitary are inferior, the individual will be small, weak, mentally sluggish, dull, apathetic, and backward. He will lack self-control, will cry easily, and will be easily discouraged.

The adrenal glands, just above the kidneys, secrete what is called adrenalin or adrenin. When adrenalin is released into the blood in sufficient quantities, it causes the arteries to contract, quickens the heart-beat, raises the blood pressure, causes sugar to be released into the blood, and interferes with digestion. Inject adrenalin under the surface of the skin and the individual grows pale, trembles, his limbs begin to twitch, his hair stands erect, he gasps for breath and displays all the signs of fear or anger. These glands are frequently called the glands of combat. Persons with hyperadrenals are courageous, combative, and cocksure. Women of the adrenal type are always more or less masculinoid. They are frequently the lady politicians and reformers. Persons with insufficient adrenalin tend toward neurasthenia, suffer from cold hands and feet, low blood pressure, are easily fatigued and irritable, likely to "go off the handle" quickly. They lack courage and frequently seek to compensate for their physiological cowardice by becoming violent or developing a resentful emotionalism. They are the persons who suffer from shell shock, melancholia, depression, and the "blues."

The interstitial glands are found in the interstices of the gonads (the glands of reproduction). It would be difficult to exaggerate their importance in determining personality.

They control those characters by which male and female are distinguished. A castrated male takes on feminine traits; a castrated female becomes masculine. If in the castrated female a testicle is grafted, the masculine traits become very marked.

These sex glands are very sensitive to the secretions of the other ductless glands and may be compared to a barometer which registers the general glandular tone of the body. It is common to exaggerate the differences between men and women. As a matter of fact the line of division is not so clear as the superficial observer is likely to suppose. There are masculine women and feminine men, a multitude of types varying from the ultra-feminine-clinging-vine female to the two-fisted-hairy-chested-he-man male. Most of us fall in between. These differences are largely the result of glandular constitution. "The degree of masculine trend in a woman," says Dr. Louis Berman, "is the crude measure of adrenal domination, the degree of feminine deviation in a man is roughly proportional to the amount of pituitary influence in his make-up."

The thymus, pineal, and parathyroid are other ductless glands which influence personality. The thymus gland, situated in the upper chest, dominates childhood. It inhibits the activity of the sex glands, and its removal hastens sexual maturity. In normal development it shrivels up at the age of five or six. Unless this takes place the individual may remain a child forever. The so-called thymocentric type is angelic, delicate, ethereal, a thing not of this world. Such persons are often homosexual, prone to illness, misfits in society who are misunderstood and misjudged. Fortunately they die young.

Hidden away at the base of the brain is the pineal gland.

It, also, seems to serve as a checkrein to growth. An inferior pineal will lead to rapid sexual development and increased growth. Very little is known concerning it. It is interesting to note that Descartes in 1628 located the soul in the pineal gland.

Situated within or directly behind the thyroid are the four parathyroid glands. They appear to play an important rôle in bone-making and in maintaining steadiness of nerve and muscle. Deficiency of parathyroid secretion produces nervous excitability. If the glands are removed, the bones soften, the teeth fall out, there is a general wasting away, and the individual dies.

The importance of these glands in molding human personality is unquestionably great. Our very limited knowledge of them makes forever untenable the notion of a mind freed from the domination of the flesh.* But it is too early to eliminate the idea of mind altogether. When we have catalogued all human traits, when we have plumbed the depths of the physiology and chemistry of thought, there yet remains the mystery of life itself and the consciousness which distinguishes men from beasts. The processes of thought which enable us to relive the events of the past and look forward to the future, to transcend the limits of time and space, remain, if not a Stygian darkness, at least a hazy

* Recent investigations carried on at San Quentin prison in California by Dr. L. L. Stanley, prison physician, and Dr. R. A. Reynolds, former president of the American Medical Society, have led them to some significant conclusions. "Every murderer, potential and actual, exhibits oversecretion of the thyroid gland. . . . Every forger exhibits undersecretion of the pituitary gland. Every social misfit displays malsecretion of some gland." One particularly violent prisoner serving a life sentence for murder had an abnormal thyroid gland. "We operated and reduced [the gland] to what we thought normality, and today that prisoner is entirely tractable." See *N. Y. Times*, Feb. 9, 1930; and see Schlapp and Smith, *The New Criminology*, New York, 1928.

dusk. The symphony cannot be wholly appreciated by analyzing the mechanics of its production. If music is the language of the soul, the mind is its recording instrument. It is well to know the sources from which human behavior springs, but we cannot describe by any known chemical, mechanical, or physiological formula the sensation which the thirsty traveler enjoys when he quaffs a cool refreshing drink.

Much can be learned about behavior from a study of abnormals. In one sense we are all abnormal, since the normal is a statistical mean or average which exactly fits no individual who ever lived. Except in extreme cases abnormal behavior is not sharply distinguishable from the normal. Thus one type of abnormal behavior is called *antisocial.* Murder, arson, and rape fall clearly into this category, but there is a difference of opinion as to whether war, capital punishment, and the manufacture and sale of noxious foodstuffs and worthless or harmful patent medicines should be classified as antisocial.

Hysteria, obsession neurosis, and paranoia are more definite forms of abnormal behavior. These are usually *functional* disorders caused by nervous derangement and are to be distinguished from *organic* or *constitutional* disorders which result from infection, poison, apoplexy, syphilis, and so forth. *Hysteria* results from dissociation of a group of reflexes from the main stream of reflex activity. Hysterical persons go off on tangents which have no relation to the immediate world in which they live, responding to imaginary situations as though they were real. They are extremely suggestible, suffer from somnambulism, and are subject to fits and paralysis. *Obsession neurosis* arises from an over-

weighing of some particular element in consciousness. Such individuals become obsessed with the notion that they "must" behave in a particular way with reference to a particular situation and are "uncomfortable" until they do so. The so-called *compulsion neurosis* is a form of obsessional behavior where the individual is "compelled" to do something such as stepping on every crack in the sidewalk or committing murder. The Loeb-Leopold case is said to have been an instance of this form of behavior. The intensity of the obsession varies greatly. Some people "must" vote the Republican or Democratic ticket, others "must" tell the neighbor's about Mrs. Blank's infidelity; they are "uncomfortable" unless they do. *Paranoia* is a form of delusional behavior. Two major subdivisions are recognized: *paranoia persecutoria* and *paranoia expansiva.* In the former the individual suffers from a delusion of persecution; he is convinced that someone is "after him," wants to harm him in some way. In the latter, *paranoia expansiva*, he has delusions of grandeur, imagines himself to be a new Messiah, a great statesman, or some other famous personality. It is not uncommon for religious groups, fraternal orders, towns, and nations to suffer from this form of paranoia.

The transition from normal to abnormal behavior can be illustrated by the so-called *defense mechanism.* Most of us are in constant conflict with other persons and with various parts of our own personalities. We like to be "thought well of" and to "think well of ourselves." To do this it is frequently necessary to "kid" ourselves and others into believing that what we *are* or *do* is the result of causes quite different from what may actually be the case. We put forth *good* reasons for our conduct instead of the *real* reasons. This

process is known as *rationalization.* Thus a man who is unable to "get along" with his fellows, who cannot hold a job or make friends, because he is irritable, quick-tempered, or lazy, comforts himself with the idea that he is "misunderstood," or that he is such a superior person that other people are "jealous" of him and want to "keep him down." The poor man consoles himself with the notion that he is "poor but honest." The ugly girl finds comfort in the belief that her more comely sisters are "beautiful but dumb." Many religions seem to be defense mechanisms on a large scale. The poor, persecuted, downtrodden Christian prides himself on his poverty and his subjection. Blessed are the meek, the poor, and the persecuted, for they shall be the greatest in the kingdom of heaven. Upon the day of judgment the first shall be last and the last shall be first. The under dogs take pleasure in the fact that it is as hard for a rich man to get into heaven as for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle.

The human organism is incessantly active, but the conditions of coöperative life require that this activity be guided and controlled. In seeking satisfaction for our basic needs we are compelled to observe the social amenities. The resulting restraint induces in most people a feeling of inferiority. To resolve these conflicts and overcome this sense of inferiority we may *rationalize* or we may become inordinately aggressive, dictatorial, and domineering. Some become great warriors, statesmen, or reformers, for only by controlling others can they acquire or maintain respect for themselves. We must find "compensation" or be completely crushed in the presence of a cruel and devastating world.

A word should be said concerning the theories of Dr.

Sigmund Freud. All human beings have certain fundamental needs or desires. The most important of these is sex. Between the urge and its satisfaction society interposes innumerable obstacles. The result is a suppression of the desire into what Freud calls the "unconscious." But these desires keep welling up, beating at the doors of consciousness and realization. During periods of great emotional strain they come to the surface. We must be constantly on guard lest they crop up and make us appear criminal or ridiculous. Now the happy hunting ground for these suppressed desires is the dream world. During sleep our own guard is down, the restraining influence of other persons is absent, and our ego has free play. In our dreams we become Don Juans, millionaires, heroes, and saints. These secret desires, which during waking hours we keep in leash, are released — they have never been put completely out of the theater of our thoughts, but have merely been forced to take back seats, ready to move down front when the lights go out.

There is enough truth in most of the foregoing theories to entitle them to consideration. Error arises when we attempt to explain all human behavior in terms of any one of them. Individuals differ in constitution and character. No two of us act exactly alike or for the same reasons. We all live in different worlds. But we must not exaggerate these differences. In spite of all, we are social creatures. There are common threads which bind us to each other. Our habits and habiliments differ, our lives flow in many divergent streams, but, like the Colonel's lady and Mrs. O'Grady, we are kindred under the skin.

Chapter II

SOCIAL BEHAVIOR

No man lives unto himself alone. From infancy to old age, from the cradle to the grave, he is influenced by other human beings. The family into which he is born is a social institution; there is no way to escape it and live. Living with other people is a physical necessity.

It does not help us in understanding social behavior to assert that man has a gregarious instinct. There is no more reason for attributing group behavior to instinct than for saying that there is an instinct for the blood to circulate or the heart to beat.

Much has been said concerning the conflict between the *individual* and *society*. Thus stated, there is no such conflict. Every individual is the product of social conditioning. Persons born and raised in one environment differ from those reared in another. The so-called conflict between the individual and society is really the clash of different cultures and habit patterns.

It is a mistake to speak of the "individual" and "society" as though they were separate and distinct entities. As M. P. Follett says in her book *The New State*, "we are only just beginning to see that there is no 'individual,' that there is no 'society.' . . . The old psychology was based on the isolated individual as the unit, on the assumption that a man thinks, feels, and judges independently. Now we know that there

is no such thing as a separate ego, that individuals are created by reciprocal interplay." A separate individual apart from society is as much an abstraction as "society" apart from individuals. The very word "I" implies the existence of "you" or it has no meaning.

The helplessness of the human infant makes his very existence depend upon some social unity. Throughout life he is influenced by the groups with which he comes into contact. From his parents he inherits, through the germ cell, the raw material of organic life such as eyes, ears, nose, mouth, internal organs, glandular constitution. Of equal importance in determining his behavior is what may be called his *social heritage*, that is, the institutions, customs, manners, opinions, and attitudes of the group into which he is born. The organic needs of the individual, such as food and sex-relief, constitute the physiological framework around which his habit patterns are built. The manner in which these fundamental needs are satisfied depends upon his social background and environment.

It is impossible to understand public opinion in the United States without taking into account the forces, both physical and intellectual, which have molded our character as a nation. Those who would understand why we behave like Americans would do well to read such books as Charles and Mary Beard's *Rise of American Civilization*, Vernon Parrington's *Main Currents in American Thought*, and Frederick Turner's *Frontier in American History*. During the major part of our history we have been a frontier people. In a very real sense America was the "promised land" for millions of poor Europeans. In less than a century these immigrants had conquered, cleared, and cultivated an area nearly

as large as the whole of continental Europe. To do this required unceasing toil. From sunup to sundown they were occupied with the task of wringing sustenance from the wilderness. The gospel of the frontier was hard work, and the rewards were measured in terms of material things. A man's worth was determined by his possessions, for these were the outward symbols of a shrewd and energetic husbandry. There was but little time for reflection and philososphy. "The stern demands of necessity held men in their grip, narrowing the horizon of their minds and obscuring the vision of their larger accomplishment." Art galleries, music, poetry, are not the implements for taming a wilderness, and they did not flourish. If today Americans seem materialistic, with little regard or appreciation for the arts, we can at least understand why this is so if we take account of the conditions out of which American civilization has grown. On the frontier, leisure, which is the life of art, was comparatively unknown. The frontier tradition of incessant activity persists even today. Our amusements are those which can be taken on the run. Jazz is more than a name for a kind of music, it is a state of mind. Even our so-called vacations are so filled with activity that we have to rest up from them. On the frontier physical energy and endurance were at a premium. The games were those which tested strength and endurance. So today we have long-distance walking contests, prize fights, and even dance marathons, emphasizing not mental fitness but physical prowess, not brains but brawn.

Another important factor in our social background is the heritage left us by the Puritans of New England. It is significant that the founding fathers who shaped the destiny of

America in thought and manners brought with them the ideas of John Calvin rather than those of Erasmus or Luther. "One thing and one thing only," said Martin Luther, "is necessary for Christian life, righteousness and liberty. . . . Neither pope nor bishop nor any other man has the right to impose a single syllable of law upon a Christian man without his consent; and if he does, it is done in the spirit of tyranny." But it was from Calvin rather than Luther that we derived our theories of morals and legislation. To Calvin authority was quite consistent with Christian dogma. God himself was an unlimited irresponsible monarch, and the Calvinists carried this absolutism over into the congregation and the community. As Parrington says, "Calvinism in its primary assumptions was a composite of oriental despotism and sixteenth-century monarchism, modified by the medieval conception of a city state." In the Calvinist community the citizens lived in glass houses, constantly on the alert for a visitation from the committee on public morals. Life was regarded as the drama of salvation, a constant battle between the Spirit and the Flesh. Sex was sin, and in his war against it the Calvinist gave no quarter. The true city of God was to be achieved by banishing the pleasures of the flesh. "It is sad to reflect," says Tawney, "that the attainment of so laudable an end involved the systematic use of torture, the beheading of a child for striking its parents, and the burning of a hundred and fifty heretics in sixty years." To the Calvinist idleness was almost as great a sin as lust. This of course fits perfectly into a frontier civilization where industry is all-important. "Labor," said the Calvinist, "is a thing so good and Godlike . . . that it makes the body hale and strong and cures the sicknesses

produced by idleness. . . . In the things of this life, the laborer is most like God." The American ideals of industry, sobriety, frugality, and thrift come straight from our frontier life and our Calvinist heritage. Prosperity was sanctified as the material manifestation of divine grace. Calvin thus did for the bourgeoisie what Karl Marx did for the proletariat; he infused their materialism with morality. These ideas and conventions handed down from generation to generation enter into the warp and woof of our culture and explain much in contemporary American civilization. We still worship material success and chastity, and in doing so pay homage to the god our fathers gave us.

Thus the child finds an elaborate civilization awaiting him. Ideas and habits formed in a bygone age continue to influence him. He fits into historic institutions and is molded by them. The family, play group, school, church, city, state, and nation are organized ways in which the individual enters social relations. They make possible a richer life than could be attained if individuals lived in isolation, by permitting that division of labor upon which modern civilization rests. The necessities of civilized life, in turn, compel us to maintain cordial and coöperative relations with our fellows. We group ourselves together to work, to play, and to worship. Without society, with its cultural heritage, man would be a beast.

A great deal of nonsense has been written about the behavior of men in society. Writers have romanticized about the will of the people without telling us what they mean by "the people" or how it expresses its will. One school of social psychologists speaks of a *group mind*. They assume that when a number of persons come together, there

is created, by some subtle alchemy, a mind and personality distinct from the minds and personalities of the individuals who make up the group. Thus a lynching mob or a church congregation is supposed to develop a sort of *oversoul*. This, of course, is sheer mysticism. It can neither be proved nor disproved. In the following discussion we shall indulge in no such myths. Social psychology must concern itself with the behavior of individuals in so far as that behavior influences or is influenced by other individuals. It is only when the conditioning of individuals has been so similar that they react to given situations in substantially the same way that we are justified in speaking of public opinion.

Walter Bagehot in a famous book, *Physics and Politics*, attributed all social behavior to the influence of unconscious imitation. "The greatest sage," he said, "soon shares the opinion of the party with which he votes and the sect with which he worships." Introduced into a group which is already a going concern, he takes its customs and conventions, its prejudices and superstitions, as his own. Through imitation a "cake of custom" is constructed which acts as a cement binding the group together. This is merely another way of saying that the individual responds to those stimuli with which he comes most frequently into contact or which are more intense than others. Constantly bathed in the atmosphere of a particular culture, most individuals naturally take on the color of their environment.

The "cake of custom" may be broken in many ways. War, disease, flood and famine, scientific invention and discovery, may literally uproot traditional ways of life and establish new norms of conduct. Consider, for example, the effect of the World War or the invention of the steam engine upon

existing morals and manners. Conflict arises when the new or the strange seeks to impose itself too suddenly upon the community. As a usual thing, however, there is no sharp break with the past. Even in the face of new situations and a changed world, old customs linger. In the age of the steam engine and the aeroplane many of our social institutions and habits are those of the age of the stagecoach and the witch doctor. We are, in many respects, old savages in a new civilization.

The most important characteristic of the group is *homogeneity*. In order to achieve social unity it is necessary that the individual members of the group think and act in pretty much the same way. To permit any great degree of variation would destroy the possibility of that coöperative behavior for which the group exists. Since this is the case, originality is frowned upon if it swerves too far from the behavior patterns of the crowd. In matters of dress, morality, politics, and religion the individual must conform, be cast out, or be crushed. In a community where Protestantism is the accepted faith, Catholics and Jews will be looked upon with suspicion. The heretic in any community is merely the man who does not accept the dogmas of the herd. Conduct which differs too widely from the normal will either be laughed at as absurd or forcibly suppressed as indecent or dangerous. To create a sensation in almost any town, one has but to dress in some unusual fashion. It would never do in an American city to be seen wearing a straw hat after the fifteenth of September.

What is true of dress is equally true of ideas. Imagine the distress one would cause should he rise and sing the *International* at a meeting of the Daughters of the American

Revolution. To be a Republican in many Southern states until quite recent times was tantamount to branding oneself as a negro or a "nut." When the community is emotionally aroused, as during a war or a great religious revival, to proclaim new or unusual opinions is to invite mayhem or manslaughter. Even in the arts, our opinions must conform to what is called "good taste," that is, herd opinion. There is an aphorism which says, "When in Rome, do as the Romans do," and it is not bad advice to follow if one wishes to "get along."

Every group has its idols and saints, persons who are thought to exemplify its ideals and aspirations. To question the all-seeing and divine wisdom of the fathers of the Constitution in American conservative circles is almost as serious as to doubt the divinity of Jesus in a fundamentalist community. Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln are prominent names in the American pantheon. Among more recent leaders, Roosevelt and Wilson are now in process of canonization. When Rupert Hughes published the first volume of his biography of Washington, he aroused a storm of protest which has not yet subsided. He sought to portray Washington as a man who, among other things, was quite humanly fond of wine, of games, and of women. But these things did not fit the popular picture of the enshrined Washington. A responsible public official in New York said, at the time, that Hughes should be publicly flogged for besmirching the fair name of the "father of his country." To criticize these demigods is not only unpatriotic, it borders on sacrilege.

But the gods of the crowd are not always of flesh and blood. In the United States the Constitution itself has become an idol, a parchment calf before which all "true

patriots should bow down." To our ultra-patriotic groups it has become the ark and covenant of American civilization. Suggest that the Constitution is less than Holy Writ, and you will be denounced as an enemy of your country. The Declaration of Independence is another such idol. Often the real meaning and purpose of such documents languish from too much worshiping. So securely are they locked in the sanctuary that they lose all connection with the practical situations for which they were designed.

The crowd man, and we are all crowd men, feels comfortable in the crowd and uncomfortable when isolated. We all like to be with people who are like us and who share our views and habits. Strange faces, customs, manners, and ideas may interest us for a time, but we are rarely happy for long until we find ourselves "at home" among our own kind. We do not, as a regular thing, associate with persons who differ markedly from us. A phrase which one hears often on the lips of college students when discussing prospective members for their fraternities is, "Oh! he's a nice guy all right, but he simply isn't our type."

The successful man is he who wins the approbation of his contemporaries. This he does by appealing to and complying with the habits of the herd. He must share, or pretend to share, its passions and prejudices, its hopes and fears. If he wishes to lead the group on new paths, he must not say so. The successful innovator is the one who can present new ideas and new ways of doing things under the guise of old herd opinions. He must serve his new wine in old bottles stamped with familiar labels. In America he will appeal to the shades of Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, or Wilson, pronounce the Constitution the greatest boon to man since

Moses, and denounce those who oppose him as immoral and un-American. To do otherwise is to be as a voice crying in the wilderness. It may be as Trevelyan says, that "The character of a public man can best be judged when he is opposed to some violent and almost universal passion of his fellow countrymen. Then will be seen the stuff of which he is made." But such an individual rarely wins the praise of his own generation. He is too far in the vanguard and must wait for the crowd to catch up.

The individual becomes important by identifying himself with a group. His own sense of inferiority is swallowed up in the strength of the crowd, be it church, club, trade union, fraternity, or nation. The more powerful the group to which he belongs, the greater is his satisfaction, for the more does it exalt his ego. College students always speak of the victories of their athletic teams as "our" victories. "We" beat Cornell, or "we" must beat Harvard, is the expression used by the lowliest freshman who has no actual part in the game. "My" town and "my" country, "our" navy and "our" foreign policy are other instances. By identifying ourselves with the group, we enjoy a sense of leadership and power which as isolated individuals we cannot feel.

Man "is more sensitive to the voice of the herd than to any other influence," says Trotter. "It can inhibit or stimulate his thought and conduct. It is the source of his moral codes, of the sanctions of his ethics and philosophy. . . . It can make him acquiesce in his own punishment and embrace his executioner, submit to poverty, bow to tyranny, and sink without complaint under starvation." It is the master of his fate, the captain of his soul.

The crowd offers a medium for the unconscious expres-

sion of suppressed desires. In this respect it resembles the dream, delusion, and certain forms of hysterical behavior. "In the crowd," says Everett Dean Martin, "the primitive ego achieves its wish by actually gaining the assent and support of a section of society. The immediate social environment is all pulled in the same direction as the unconscious desire. . . . In other words, a crowd is a device for indulging ourselves in a kind of temporary insanity by all going crazy together." Some groups develop *delusions of grandeur*, others *delusions of persecution*. Often these two go together, the one acting as compensation for the other. "My country, right or wrong," "manifest destiny," "the white man's burden," "America first," are phrases which indicate a delusion of grandeur. Every nation tends to regard itself as the final flower of the evolutionary process. Each thinks of itself as divinely appointed to carry the "blessings" of its culture to those who dwell in darkness. Most reform groups develop delusions of this kind. To the radical prohibitionist the "suppression of the traffic in strong drink" is by all odds the most important problem before the people. Every other social and political question is subordinated to the all-consuming passion for aridity. When the prohibitionist speaks of "respect for the Constitution" he means the eighteenth amendment. Practically all fervent religious groups are victims of this state of mind. Each believes that its particular brand of morality and worship is the only true way to salvation. The early missionary movement was based on this assumption.

Many groups suffer from delusions of persecution. The Daughters of the American Revolution wage incessant war upon imaginary foes who are seeking to "undermine and

destroy our government." It publishes black lists of the "enemy" and sees in almost every intellectual a secret emissary of the Third International. Senator Heflin of Alabama is convinced that the Catholic Church is bent on bringing the White House under the control of the Vatican. Nor is Heflin an isolated example of this type of thought; it is a widespread delusion among a large section of our most militant Protestant population. Any number of similar illustrations will occur to the reader. "The Bolshevists are in secret league with the Germans to destroy civilization"; "socialists are planning to corrupt the morals of our youth and undermine the sacredness of the home"; "Wall Street is conspiring to rob the people of their liberties"; "Japan is getting ready to wage war on us"; "The wets are bent on destroying the Constitution." Communists are convinced that all those who disagree with the gospel according to Karl Marx have sold their souls to the capitalists. According to the *Daily Worker*, organ of the communists in New York, "The American Federation of Labor is an enemy of the worker" and William Green, its president, is a "labor betrayer" and a secret "agent of Wall Street." Most of these groups engage in a species of shadow-boxing, fighting against the figments of their own fevered imaginations.

The "enemy," real or imaginary, against which the group is for the moment aligned becomes the sign and symbol of all that is vicious, immoral, and dangerous. To the extreme Ku Kluxer the Catholic Church is Antichrist; priests are lecherous renegades who use the nuns as concubines and bury their numerous illegitimate children in lime pits in the cellars of the churches. The widely circulated bogus oath of the Knights of Columbus attributed all manner of crimes to

that organization. During the war the allied peoples "created a compound of hatred out of the enemy abroad and all their opponents at home," says Lippmann. The Germans and the pro-Germans were but the hosts of Satan pitted against the legions of the Lord on the bloody field of Armageddon. To the members of the National Security League, the communists of Russia are the enemies of chastity, the home, private property, God, and the American Constitution.

In the crowd individual responsibility is reduced almost to the vanishing point. The knowledge that other persons think and act as we do tends to give us a feeling of invincibility. We reason as the schoolboys who say, "If we all play hooky at the same time, they won't expel us all. If they do, the school will have to close down." In union there is irresponsibility as well as strength. In 1919, during the Armistice Day parade in Centralia, Washington, several members of the American Legion were shot down when, as the best evidence seems to indicate, they attempted to raid the I. W. W. hall. The entire community seemed suddenly to go insane. Respectable and ordinarily law-abiding citizens behaved as madmen. They seized a certain Wesley Everest, an I.W.W. ex-service man, unsexed him, beat him, hanged him twice, and riddled his body with bullets. It is hard to believe that as individuals these men would be capable of such fiendish conduct. In the mob their sense of responsibility left them and they became little better than savages on a head hunt.

The individual in the crowd has little shyness or shame. Few persons would venture, under ordinary circumstances, upon a public street dressed in brilliantly colored pantaloons and a beplumed fez for a hat. But when fifty or a hundred

of "the boys" are similarly garbed their shyness vanishes and they not only consent to appear in such a costume but actually take pride in doing so. Normally no individual college student would appear in public in his pajamas or nightshirt. Get five hundred of them to do so together and they will organize a nightshirt parade and act the part of perfect hooligans. "It's only," says Galsworthy in his story *The Pack*, "when men run in packs that they lose their sense of decency. At least that's my experience. Individual man — I'm not speaking of savages — is more given to generosity than meanness, rarely brutal, inclines in fact to be a gentleman. It's when you add three or four more to him that his sense of decency, his sense of personal responsibility, his private standards, go by the board." The crowd is a "Procrustean bed on which every spiritual superiority may be lopped off to the common measure." Individual differences are suppressed. The crowd is absolute, intolerant, and dictatorial; its behavior varies from maudlin sentimentality to homicidal hysteria, from the high-sounding idealism of the crusaders to the fiendish cries of a lynching mob.

The real motives of groups are frequently disguised. *Rationalization* is a common device of individuals in crowds. A mob engaged in beating an unfortunate prostitute or radical will do so in the name of "public morality" and "law and order." A negro is burned at the stake, not, as is frequently the case, to afford temporary release from a life of boredom or give vent to suppressed sexual urges, but to "protect the honor of white womanhood." * Peoples go to war, not for steel and gold or to find an outlet for pent-up

* See *Rope and Faggot*, by Walter White, for an excellent study of lynching.

emotions, but to "make the world safe for democracy," to "defend our homes and firesides," or even to "enforce peace." Every war, from the crowd's point of view, is a defensive war. Peeping Toms and professional Paul Prys who have an insatiable curiosity concerning sexual irregularity often join societies for the prevention of vice. This serves a double purpose. It places them in a strategic position to satisfy their curiosity and at the same time provides a convenient cloak for their real motives. Professional politicians, whose chief concern is the spoils of office, talk grandly about protecting the "people" from the "interests" or making "England a fit place for heroes to live in."

The slogans to which the crowd responds are usually extremely vague. "Liberty," "equality," and "fraternity" cannot be precisely defined; yet they are among the most powerful of crowd symbols. Into such vague words and phrases the individual can read his own meanings. The more vague such slogans are, the larger the group to which they will appeal. Anarchists, socialists, capitalists, and communists all respond to the cry for "liberty"; but the meaning which each group attaches to the word depends upon its peculiar social heritage. To appeal to smaller groups it is necessary to fit the slogan to the familiar hopes and fears of the individual members. It would be useless to appeal to communists with the phrase "private property is sacred" or "profits and civilization go hand in hand." The cry for "white supremacy" will only enrage a Negro or Chinese crowd, although it is part of the regular stock in trade of the Nordicist. It would never do to praise "scabs" before a trade union convention or denounce them to the National Association of Manufacturers. As these slogans take on

precise meaning, the extent of their appeal is limited. Thus most Americans would agree that "free speech" is a fundamental right; but if one said, "free speech for communists, advocates of birth control, and atheists" as well as others, the extent of the agreement would rapidly diminish.

To appeal to large masses of people we should seek to strike, as nearly as possible, the least common denominator of human desire. Consequently an appeal to the desires for sex-relief, physical comfort, health, and beauty will have the widest response. The more the group appealed to feels a lack in any of the foregoing respects, the more successful will be the appeal. "A living wage" would elicit only a slight response in a group enjoying a high standard of economic well-being as compared with a group of underpaid, undernourished workers.

Most social behavior is in response to mental *stereotypes*. These are merely standardized ideas or attitudes arising from inadequate observation or knowledge. The world of affairs is so large and our knowledge so limited that our ideas of the world outside are compounded of what others report to us and what we imagine. Even where we are privileged to make first-hand observations, our conclusions are likely to be colored by our social background. As Walter Lippmann says, "In the great blooming, buzzing confusion of the outer world we pick out what our culture has already defined for us." In almost any situation one can easily find elements which confirm preëxisting opinions and prejudices. Reports on the communist experiment in Russia are almost as varied as the reporters themselves. In discussing prohibition in the United States, one person will emphasize the corruption, crime, and hypocrisy which has followed in the

wake of our "noble experiment"; another will see in it only unadulterated despotism, while a third will regard it as the basic cause of our progress and prosperity. On the whole, we tend to see and believe those things which fit into our existing culture patterns.

The fact that our knowledge is meager does not prevent us from forming wholesale conclusions and generalizations. A friend of mine is convinced that "most Englishmen are dishonest." When asked to give reasons for this belief, he cited the fact that he had been cheated by a barmaid in a London "pub." One encounters a lazy Negro, a witty Irishman, or an avaricious Jew and forthwith concludes that "all Negroes are lazy, Irishmen are witty, and Jews are grasping." Chance associations of this kind explain many of our attitudes. When repeated in newspapers, cartoons, and conversation they may determine the opinions and attitudes of an entire community. Thus public opinion is a compound of myth and metaphor.

Innumerable illustrations of stereotypes might be cited. The following are taken from the replies of several college students to the question, "What in your opinion is the state of affairs in present day Soviet Russia?" This question was asked without any previous instruction. The replies were:

1. "Russia, as I think of it, is a country in which turmoil and chaos are prevalent. Everyone is poor and lives wretchedly. Law-abiding citizens are deported when discovered. Aristocrats, the backbone of every successful nation, are murdered. Capitalists do not exist. Ignorant assassins live in royal palaces and style themselves rulers by popular mandate, but are soon supplanted by other beasts who have attained greater success in learning the art of deviltry."

2. "When Russia is mentioned to me, there comes to my mind a picture of men tearing about the country, staging revolutions in towns; a picture of a country ruled by autocratic, unintelligent heathen; a picture of mobs of homeless, parentless brats."

3. "Violence, murder, anarchy, bloodshed, and oppression, the rule of a million under dogs, who miraculously seized the power of a great country and proceed to force the hordes of uneducated peasants into accepting their misrule. Apparently they have attempted such horrible and decadent practices as the communization of women, the taking away of children from parents to be brought up by the state. All of which have, of course, proved abortive."

Another group of students were asked to write down the first thing that came to mind when certain words were read to them. Following are some of the replies:

Eugene V. Debs: Socialist jailbird. I don't like him.
Japan: Our next rival. Big navy. Poor race intellectually.
Free love: Judge Ben Lindsey. Companionate marriage.
Bolshevik: Bombs. Slaughter. Anarchy. Fanatics.
Germany: Science. Hard-working. Good country. Good people.
Trade union: Socialism. Picketing. Agitators. Dangerous.
Negro: Smell. Harlem. Revival meetings. Lazy.
Atheism: Lazy man's religion.

The significance of these ideas is that they undoubtedly represent the fixed opinions of the groups from which these students come. Much of our education in family, school, and church consists in passing on to the younger generation the stereotypes of the old. The Americanization movement in the United States is really a campaign for substituting American stereotypes for those of the immigrant groups. A

recently arrived Hungarian, Pole, or Jew will probably miss the significance of the Fourth of July, Memorial Day, or the "Mayflower aristocracy," but within a generation he and his children will not only share the enthusiasm for these things but will boast of being one hundred per cent Americans. There is, of course, an economy in this. It is much easier to classify a person by saying, "Oh, he's a Bolshevik" — meaning that he does not share the prevailing opinions of the herd — than to enter into a careful analysis of his character. Since it is utterly impossible for everyone to be thoroughly well-informed on everything, we all fall back on stereotyped ways of thought and behavior. The danger to clear thinking lies not so much in the stereotype itself as in our failure to recognize it as such. When we realize that many of our most fervently held opinions are little better than blind hunches, we are likely to develop that healthful skepticism which is the father of tolerance and truth.

Increased knowledge is the most effective solvent for stereotypes. It is not uncommon for people to cling most tenaciously to those ideas which have the least foundation in fact. The most frantic defenders of the Constitution are usually those who know the least about that document as it has grown in the hands of the Supreme Court. The gods and idols of the crowd can only exist as stereotypes, or as Santayana puts it, as hypotheses. The moment we define or describe them with any precision, their halos wane and their divinity takes flight. One reason for the outcry against any criticism of the accepted idols of the herd is that such criticism penetrates the mystic veil of ignorance which envelopes the altars of our tribal gods. It is for this reason that such books as J. Allen Smith's *Spirit of the American Govern-*

ment and Charles Beard's *Economic Interpretation of the Constitution of the United States* are banned from some libraries, schools, and colleges and their authors denounced as un-American. "You must not enquire into the mystery which surrounds a king."

Chapter III

THE PILLARS OF SOCIETY

1. The Family and the Church

THE FAMILY

The family is the germ cell of society. No individual can escape its influence. Within the family is to be found the germ of all those potentialities which later ripen into love and hate, work and play, obedience and revolt, reverence and agnosticism, patriotism and treason. It is the matrix which molds the human personality and gives it the initial impetus and direction determining its goal and the means to its fulfillment. Family life is the index and barometer of civilization.

The race, the nation, and the community achieve their only sure immortality through the family. It is the basic vehicle for the transmission of our social heritage. Within it we receive our first impressions. It is the source of our first loyalties and antipathies.

Historically the family has fulfilled many functions, biological, economic, recreational, and religious. The emphasis which is placed upon any one of these varies with time and place and determines the character of the family and the social order of which it is a part. Perhaps no institution presents a wider variety of forms.

In no society is there complete freedom in choosing one's

mate. Within each group numerous restrictions prevail. Thus marriage between Catholics and Jews or Protestants in America is discouraged. Not only do people marry within their own religious and racial group as a rule, but also within rather definite economic and cultural groups as well. When the son of a hodcarrier marries a banker's daughter, it is a subject for wide comment; and should a Nordic marry a Negro or a Jew, there is a sharp lifting of eyebrows and perhaps a shudder of apprehension at the biological dangers supposedly inherent in such a union.

The modern family dates from the industrial revolution. But it would be folly to overlook the influence which the Christian religion, with its emphasis upon chastity, has had upon our ideas of marriage and family life. To the early Christian, marriage was a device for curbing the lusts of the flesh in those who found celibacy impossible. In his first letter to the Corinthians, St. Paul said: "It is good for a man not to touch a woman. Nevertheless to avoid fornication let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have her own husband. . . . For I would that all men were even as I myself. . . . But if they cannot contain, let them marry: for it is better to marry than to burn."

During the middle ages marriage was a sacrament, and the Council of Trent (1546-1563) "denied the validity of marriages not celebrated by a priest." It was thought that unless consecrated by the church sexual relations even in marriage were sinful. With the Protestant reformation came the idea that marriage might be viewed as a civil contract. The family came to be regarded as a highly desirable institution in itself, and celibacy, even for the clergy, was discouraged. "When the mother," said Luther, "carefully looks

after her family, provides for her children, feeds them, washes them, and rocks them in the cradle [her calling] is a happy and a holy one." But notwithstanding the humanizing tendencies of the Protestant revolt, sex continued to be regarded as "mysteriously evil, nasty, and unspeakable, a thing somehow born of sin and the devil." This conception was reinforced by the Calvinists, whose ideas formed the intellectual framework of our own New England society. Even today there is a tendency to look upon sex and sin as synonymous.

The notion of the father as the lord and master of the family is reminiscent of the primitive custom of conquest and purchase in the acquisition of wives. Adultery was punished not only because it was sin but also because it involved trespass on the property of another. We continue to speak of unchaste women as "damaged goods." Because women were regarded as property, they were necessarily subject to the absolute will of their husbands and owners. But the influence of Christianity is to be seen here also. The biblical command can be cited: "Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands as unto the Lord." The belief that women are inherently inferior to men has profoundly influenced the family as a social institution; yet into the hands of these supposedly inferior beings was intrusted the most sacred and important function of the community — the education of the young.

Under the rules of the common law, which the colonists brought with them from England, women were regarded as perpetual minors. A married woman lived under the dictatorship and tutelage of her husband; she had no separate existence. She could not own property, claim wages earned,

or collect damages for injuries to her person and character. The children, and there were many of them, were the sole property of the father. "He could give or will away from the mother her living and even her unborn children. . . . The law protected women from being beaten, except in moderation and with a stick no bigger than a man's thumb, the size and weight of the man not being specified. 'Such a favorite,' said Blackstone, 'is woman under the laws of England.'" She was her husband's bed-warmer and servant, subject at all times to the arbitrary will of her lord and master. The family in those days was a despotism, none the less despotic for being occasionally benevolent. Mother and children were on the defensive; and the extreme attachment and sentimental regard which Americans have for "mother" is no doubt in part due to the sympathetic coöperation of the under dogs against a tyrant. As women achieve independence and equality, this attitude will wane.

In the early days of the Republic the family played a predominant rôle in the life of the community. It was a closely knit, self-sufficient social unit. Education, by precept and example, production of economic goods, recreation, and religion were all carried on within the family. Children knew few ideals or occupations beyond those of the immediate family group. It is small wonder that such a civilization was static and conservative. There was little change of opinion from one generation to the next. The stream of community life flowed serenely on, uninterrupted by the turbulent eddies and whirlpools of new and strange ideas. If the father was a farmer, the child became a farmer or a farmer's wife; if the parents were Methodists, so likewise were the children. The political opinions of one generation became those of the

next. The hard cake of custom was not broken, and the living were ruled by the dead.

With the coming of steam and the rise of the factory system, the family moves to the city. The detached house gives way to the tenement and the apartment, the wide yard to a city street as playground. The triumph of the machine takes from the family its function as a production unit. Women and children as well as men take their places at the loom and the chain conveyor. Home becomes a few rooms in a tenement house where the family eat and sleep and frequently do not even eat. There is little time for education in the home; that function is taken over by the school; recreation no longer consists of games and conversation in a quiet circle before the fireside; the saloon, the club, the playground, the street, the motor car, and latterly the movie destroy the pleasant scene. Religion languishes for want of leisure to instruct the children. The home and the family become units for begetting children who are soon swallowed up in the seething cauldron of city life.

As a consequence, the importance of the family as a molder of opinion declines. The schools are taking children "away from their parents for longer periods of time, 78 days in the year 1870, but 136 [168] days in 1926; and they are taking them away from their parents at tenderer ages, for one in six of the children between the ages of five and six are in schools now." The family is becoming less stable. The number of divorces per thousand married persons has increased almost 500 per cent in the United States since 1870. In 1924 there was approximately one divorce for every six marriages; in 1887 the ratio was one for every seventeen. This consequent breaking up of the home and the

throwing of children into an almost wholly new environment must be taken into account if we would understand the so-called "revolt of modern youth." Those who lament this tendency may derive some comfort from the fact that in 64.3 per cent of the divorces in 1924 no children were involved. It is probable that a larger number of people refrain from getting a divorce because of the children. The result is that in many instances incompatible parents continue to live together, and the children for whose benefit the union is maintained continue to live in an atmosphere of strained hostility, misunderstanding, and conflict.

The farm is still the greatest friend of the family and the home. Thus in 1920 while almost 62 per cent of all persons fifteen years of age and over living in rural communities were married, only 58 per cent of those living in cities were married. Although San Francisco has only 14 per cent of the total population of California, it has over 20 per cent of the divorces. Chicago, with only 48 per cent of the population of Illinois, has almost 60 per cent of the divorces. It is significant that the divorce rate is lowest among farmers and highest among actors, musicians, traveling salesmen, physicians, and surgeons. Is this one reason for the persistence in the country of traditional ways of behavior long since abandoned in the city?

Approximately two million married women in the United States are employed outside the home, about 10 per cent of the total. In 1920 one out of every eleven married women worked for pay outside the home, while in 1890 there was only one out of twenty-two. The children of these women are cared for in special day nurseries or schools, by other children, or are left to their own devices and the random

associations of the street. This means that parental authority and influence are lax or lacking and the ideas and ideals of the children are derived increasingly from outside sources.

The American family is smaller today than at any other period of our history. Although the percentage of the total population which is married has increased from 57 in 1910 to almost 60 in 1926, the birth rate has fallen from 25 per thousand to about 20 per thousand. There has been a decided increase in the number of childless marriages as well as a decrease in the size of families having children. One reason for this is the spread of birth control information and the increase in abortions. A survey made by Dr. Katherine B. Davis of 1,000 married women showed that 730 of them admitted using contraceptives and only 78 expressed disapproval of their use. V. F. Calverton estimates that over 6,000,000 contraceptives are sold every year in the city of Baltimore alone. He also estimates that there are over 80,000 criminal abortions performed every year in New York City, and cites Tobinson as authority for the statement that about 1,000,000 are performed annually in the United States. The Michigan Board of Health says that about one-third of the pregnancies terminate in abortions.

That our attitudes toward sex problems and marriage are changing there is no doubt. The economic, social, and educational functions of the family are declining. For many, marriage is coming to be an institution whose chief purpose is the establishment of congenial sexual relations. The emphasis is shifting, as Schmalhausen says, "from procreation to recreation." Reformers and the clergy are alarmed at the mounting divorce rate and the instability of the home. Companionate marriage is being urged as a device for les-

sening the hazards of marriage by giving young people an opportunity to live together for a year or so to see "how they get along" before making the union permanent. Any hope that this will lessen divorce is limited by the fact that the bulk of divorces come, not in the first or second year, but in the fourth year of marriage.

In spite of these changes, the family continues to be an important factor in molding character and opinion. Charles Merriam estimates that from 65 to 85 per cent of the voters cast their ballots for the political party of their parents, and a similar percentage cling, nominally at least, to the religion of their fathers and mothers. After all, the first opinions, attitudes, and habits with which the child comes into contact are those of his father and mother, his sisters and his brothers. If Lund's law of Primacy and Persuasion holds true, and the first impressions are the most lasting, the influence of parental patterns upon the children is tremendous.

Criminologists never tire of telling us that family life is frequently the cause of and may be the cure for crime. The records of 106 delinquent children studied by the Minnesota State School for Neglected and Dependent Children and of 91 children at the Wisconsin State School showed that in every case the family life was largely responsible. That the criminal tendencies in these youngsters were due to environment rather than heredity is indicated by the fact that in the case of the Minnesota children 83 per cent and in the Wisconsin group 85 per cent developed into respectable, self-supporting citizens when placed in a better home environment.

In Frederick Thrasher's study of over thirteen hundred gangs in Chicago, a gang map of the city shows that where

the home is unstable or inadequate and where there are few compensating factors such as playgrounds, parks, and recreation centers, the gang flourishes. Says Thrasher: "Any condition in family life which promotes neglect or repression of its boy members, indirectly promotes the gang by stimulating the boy to find the satisfaction of his wishes outside the plan and organization of family activities."

Conflict within the home is fraught with tremendous and often terrible consequences to the child. Reared in an atmosphere of misunderstanding, petty squabbling, and distrust, the child loses respect for his parents and rebels. This rebellion may extend beyond the home to the entire social structure of which the family is a part, with disastrous consequences to individual and society. "No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other." One parent attempts to teach the child obedience and respect for the rights of others, telling him that there are some things he cannot do or have; the other allows him free rein, with no restraint upon his actions or appetites. The child is torn between conflicting standards and may lose respect for both parents. Or he will become unduly fond of one and hate the other, attaching himself in later life to those who resemble the favorite parent.

The balance between liberty and authority is a difficult one to maintain in the family as in the state. "If authority," says O'Shea, "is too powerful and arbitrary, it may crush out all initiative and capacity for individual development in the child. On the other hand, if the child cannot be so easily subdued, it may make him a rebel, an iconoclast, a skeptic, incapable of conforming to any authority." An amount of

sweet reasonableness is necessary. The child should learn that there is nothing sacred about authority as such and that all obedience should be conditioned upon its social utility.

The habits of parents become the guide strings in the formation of the child's habits. A home that is dirty, disorderly, and ugly cannot hope to produce children with high standards of cleanliness, order, and beauty. Parents who openly flout the laws within the home, who speak with contempt of certain social rules and institutions, cannot complain when they discover their children to be lawless and antisocial. The pet superstitions and prejudices of parents are transferred to the children. The child hears his father denounce and deride labor unions as dangerous and un-American; and these ideas become part of his intellectual and emotional equipment which he may never shake off.

Parents, on the whole, tend to take the child too lightly. He is overwhelmed by teasing and ridicule, treated as an inferior, told that he "must be seen and not heard." Parents who demand honor and respect from their children should realize that they must give what they expect to receive. There is no more reason for regarding children as "unredeemed savages" than as "angels sent from heaven." They are human beings and deserve the same respect, tolerance, and forbearance which civilized adults accord to one another.

Professor Ogburn has shown us that marriage is a desirable state. There is less pauperism, crime, and insanity among married people than among the unmarried or the widowed. He also shows that married people actually live longer than the unmarried or widowed. The recent committee of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ on Marriage and the Home says: "Life in the home, in spite

of difficulties which it would be folly to minimize, still offers and doubtless will always offer the best environment for children, and at the same time the greatest happiness to most men and women, the strongest influences for character building, and the best security against the hazards of loneliness, sickness, and age."

The cheerlessness of the older Puritan home, with its rigid regulation of the lives of its members, is giving way to a more humane and tolerant institution wherein children are looked upon not as property or savages but as human beings upon whose shoulders rests the destiny of the race. But the picture of American family life which is presented in such books as Lynd's *Middletown* is not bright. President Hoover says that we should think of America as a nation, not of 120,000,000 people, but of 20,000,000 homes. If these homes are to be healthful and productive of the highest type of citizen, it is our duty to see that the advantages of adequate wages, housing, education, and recreation are brought within the reach of all.*

THE CHURCH

"The most practical and important thing about a man," says G. K. Chesterton, "is still his view of the universe." That is to say, his religion. Religion is more than "the sum total of one's feelings in the presence of universal mystery." It is not only "the appreciation of an unseen world," it is a way of life.

* The present outlook is not encouraging. A "study of wages and standards of living," says Abraham Epstein in *The Challenge of the Aged*, "indicates that not even during the last few years of unprecedented national prosperity did the wages of the great masses of American workers permit them to live upon the standard generally set by students and government authorities as necessary for a minimum of health and decency."

It is a truism that man creates God after his own image. To the pacifist He is the Prince of Peace, to the militarist He is the God of War. To the labor leader He is the symbol of revolt, the Carpenter of Nazareth — persecuted and crucified by the plunderbund of his own day. The poor man finds solace in the assurance that all are equal before the Great White Throne and that to the poor, the persecuted, and the meek will come the ineffable joy of eternal bliss.

The most visible sign of religious life in America is the organized church. According to the Federal Census for 1926 there are over 200,000 churches, with a total membership of 55,000,000, of whom the Catholics number some 20,000,000. Aside from about 4,000,000 Jews, the remainder are Protestants. These latter are divided into more than fifteen major sects, ranging from the Adventists to the Unitarians, the most numerous of which are the following:

Methodists	about 8,000,000
Baptists	" 8,000,000
(including some 3,000,000 Negro Baptists)	
Presbyterians	2,500,000
Lutherans	2,400,000
Disciples	1,300,000
Anglicans (Episcopalians)	1,100,000
Congregationalists	800,000
Unitarians	500,000

But a mere catalogue of these sects cannot give the full significance of Protestantism in America. In many ways it is our national religion, and lies at the foundation of our social and political structure.

We cannot here enter into the theological differences which divide the various Protestant sects from one another. A movement for federation has made some headway. The

Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America includes over twenty different sects. It was organized in 1908 and has for its major purpose "To secure a larger combined influence for the churches of Christ in all matters affecting the moral and social condition of the people, so as to promote the application of the law of Christ in every relation of human life." This group may be regarded as the left wing of American Protestantism. With an annual budget of almost $300,000, it seeks to promote tolerance, friendship, international good will, social justice, and sobriety. In a recent publication, *Christian Ideals in Industry*, there is some caustic criticism of contemporary capitalism. "Economic individualism," says this book, "transplanted to America, throve like a weed in a freshly dug garden. . . . This could result in only one thing — the concentration of power and privilege in a few hands. . . . Men of vast possessions began to conceive of themselves as especially ordained of God to hold the wealth of the world in their hands." The Council has always been friendly to labor, saying, "We must learn how to make the goods of life in a way that will enrich the lives of those who work. . . . The loss of ownership of one's tools which has come about with the modern factory system robs the worker of independence and security." Hence the necessity for labor organization, for "there is no question as to the gains of the workers through trade unions." *

The Council works actively for disarmament and a warless world. To this end it urges Sunday-school teachers and

* Speaking on "The Function of the Church in the Field of Industry," Bishop Francis J. McConnell, president of the Federal Council, said on February 4, 1930: "Encourage the person who speaks out and speaks out radically on the question of the obligations of society to industrialism. The old school of those who believe that the church is only a place of worship, is a thing of the past." See N. Y. *Times*, February 5, 1930.

ministers to make plain the devastation and destruction of war. "Probably no persons are more important in establishing a warless world," says a recent publication, "than the hundreds of thousands of Sunday-school teachers in this and other lands. For they have in their hands, Sunday after Sunday, the plastic minds of millions of children of the coming generation. . . . Care should be taken not to glorify war. . . . The horror and the wrongs and the futility of war should be made clear." Over fifty thousand copies of a book entitled *War: Its Causes, Consequences, and Cure*, by Kirby Page, were sent to Protestant ministers by this organization, and it has consistently opposed military training in schools and colleges. It is small wonder that the professional patriots regard the Council with suspicion. "There is a conviction among those who have watched the Federal Council's activities," says the super-patriotic *Patches*, "that attached to the extreme left is a pot of Soviet gold."

The Federal Council endeavors to promote better interracial relations. "Perhaps no page called Christian," it declares, "bears more blots and stains upon it than that which records the relations of Christians and Jews during almost two thousand years."

But the Federal Council is not representative of the rank and file of Protestants in America. The ethical and social idealism which it preaches does not penetrate very deeply into the rural and small-town churches which include the bulk of American Protestants. There, obscurantism, intolerance, and superstition are rife. It is from the rural and small-town Protestant church that the Ku Klux Klan draws its shock troops; and these people are more concerned with excluding or exterminating Jews and Negroes than in promoting friendly relations with them.

What are the religious beliefs of Americans? Statistics on church membership reveal very little in the way of religious opinion. A nation-wide survey of religious opinion made in 1926 by the International Advertising Association gave the following results in the fifty thousand cases studied. The answers were in reply to a questionnaire printed in one hundred and fifty newspapers in forty states.

RELIGIOUS BELIEFS OF AMERICANS

Questions	Per Cent	
	Yes	No
1. Do you believe in God?	89	11
2. Do you believe in immortality?	85	15
3. Do you believe in prayer as a means of personal relationship with God?	84	16
4. Do you believe that Jesus was divine as no other man was divine?	77	23
5. Do you regard the Bible as inspired in the sense that no other literature could be said to be inspired?	80	20
6. Are you an active member of any church?	70	30
7. Do you regularly attend any religious service?	70	30
8. Would you be willing to have your family grow up in a community where there was no church?	21	79
9. Do you regularly have family worship in your house?	40	60
10. Were you brought up in a religious home?	88	12
11. Do you send your children to any school of religious instruction (including Sunday-school)?	67	33
12. Do you think that religion in some form is a necessary element of life for the individual and the community?	90	10

A further analysis of the vote showed that "in the South

the people are extremely orthodox in their views. They very generally accept such doctrines as immortality, the divinity of Jesus, and the inspiration of the Bible, and they are strong for the church. Much the same is true of the Middle West. . . . But in the larger cities the returns indicate a greater indifference to religion." Does this help to explain anti-evolution legislation in the South and the religious conservatism of the Middle West?

A careful study of the religious beliefs of the American army during the war, made by the Federal Council's Committee on the War and the Religious Outlook, showed that while practically all the men professed Christianity, only an insignificant number had any well-defined religious convictions. There was a notable lack of enthusiasm for the church, and "denominational differences among Protestant laymen were very slight." The men objected that the salvation preached by the church is narrowly selfish, that Christianity is presented as a collection of "don'ts," and that the church does not manifest the spirit of brotherhood of which it talks. The virtues which the men admired were courage, unselfishness, generosity, loyalty, and devotion to home and mother. The vices against which the churches have thundered, such as sexual immorality, profanity, obscenity, and gambling were widely prevalent and largely condoned. Apparently during the war, at least, the "old-time religion" was tried and found wanting. Membership in the church for most of these men was not the result of conviction but of blind conformity to social habit.

The Protestant Church in America is torn between fundamentalism and modernism. The division cuts across sectarian lines and represents a profound difference in approach to religion and life. To the fundamentalist, the Bible is literally

the revealed word of God. If the book of Genesis says that "God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him," no other theory or hypothesis as to man's origin can be entertained. As the Reverend J. Frank Norris, noted fundamentalist of Texas, says: "I do not believe the Bible is literally true. I do not believe it, *I know it.*"

The indictment against Scopes in Tennessee is illustrative of this point of view. It read in part: "That John Thomas Scopes . . . did unlawfully and wilfully teach . . . certain theory and theories that deny the story of the Divine Creation of man as taught in the Bible and did teach thereof that man has descended from a lower order of animals . . . against the peace and dignity of the State." The fundamentalist insists that either the Bible is true in every part and in all details or it is not true at all; there can be no exceptions.

The South, overwhelmingly Protestant and rural, is the heart and center of fundamentalism. "Thank God for the rural districts of the South," says the Charlotte, N. C., *Observer*, "for there . . . lies the hope of fundamentalism and the teachings of Jesus Christ without blemish or without shame. If the general acceptance of the Bible and miracles of God comes from an unintelligent and unenlightened group of backward Southerners (as the modernists charge), then the South has more to be proud of than she ever dreamed. In this case we shout, 'Thanks to ignorance, and glory be to God!' Let us cease higher education, modern culture, and scientific knowledge if it inevitably causes disbelief and destruction of the Bible."

But fundamentalism is not confined to the rural South. A recent study of "The Beliefs of Seven Hundred Ministers" in and around Chicago, by George H. Betts, reveals a pre-

ponderance of fundamentalist beliefs among the clergy of that community. These ministers represented twenty different Protestant denominations. Sixty per cent of them believe that the devil exists as an actual person, and 53 per cent believe hell to be a definite place of torture with an actual location. Sixty-one per cent of them believe that "a considerable part of the human race will suffer eternal punishment because of their rejection of Christ."

At a convention of the International Walther League, representing the youth of the Lutheran Church, held in San Francisco, July 28, 1925, a resolution was adopted without a dissenting vote among the four thousand present, denouncing "modernism, liberalism, evolution, and radicalism." The convention placed itself on record as in favor of outlawing the teaching of evolution. The Reverend Billy Sunday, reformed baseball player and fundamentalist evangelist, goes up and down the land denouncing modernism to large and enthusiastic audiences. "If a minister believes and teaches evolution," says this man of God, "he is a stinking skunk and a liar." On another occasion he declared, "The consensus of scholarship can go to hell for all I care." The California Synod of the Presbyterian Church on August 21, 1925, adopted a resolution denouncing any teaching which called into question the literal truth of the Bible. Similar resolutions have been adopted by fundamentalist bodies in nearly every state in the Union.

Maynard Shipley, in his excellent book *The War on Modern Science*, says: "According to the annual census of the *Christian Herald*, the church membership of the United States at the close of 1925 was 46,883,756. . . . Now, while no one could state with accuracy just what proportion of these communicants is opposed to freedom of teaching, he

would be an optimist indeed who would place the number of anti-evolutionists . . . at fewer than 25,000,000."

That a great change in religious opinion is taking place is evident from the survey by Mr. Betts of the beliefs of two hundred students in five leading theological seminaries. Of these, only 20 per cent believe in the damnation of infidels and heathen. Only 11 per cent believe in an actual hell, 8 per cent in the literal inspiration of the Bible, and only 4 per cent believe the Bible to be "wholly free from legend." Whereas 46 per cent of the ministers hold that a belief in the Virgin Birth is essential to a Christian, only 25 per cent of the theological students subscribe to this doctrine. Modernism is apparently making inroads in the seminaries.

Equally significant are the results of a survey of religious opinion made by Professor Rudolph Binder at New York University in 1928. His results may be summarized briefly as follows:

RELIGION OF STUDENTS IN NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

Questions	Yes	No	Total	% Yes
Do you believe in a Divine Being?	330	102	432	76
Do you belief in life after death?	102	306	408	25
Were you brought up in a religious home?	285	141	426	67
Are you a member of a religious organization?	190	224	414	46
Do you attend religious services				
a) Regularly	80			19
b) Occasionally	280		421	66
c) Not at all	61			
Do you believe in evolution?	393	36	429	92
Are you happy without religion?	208	90	298	70

In answer to the question "If you are no longer religious, when did the change come?" 177 out of 432 reported no change. Of those who had experienced a change of heart, 111 said that it came in high school, and 74 said the change took place in college. Forty-five said they had never been religious, and 25 attributed the change to "other causes." Of the 393 students who believed in evolution, 291, or 74 per cent, declared that this theory had affected their religious belief. In answer to the question "Do you get your moral ideas from religion or other sources?" 141 answered "From religion," and 256 answered "From other sources." It is significant that of the 330 students who admitted a belief in a Divine Being, only 6, or 2 per cent, regarded God as having human form.

To the modernist the Bible is not the "very word of the very God" but a collection of historical facts, legends, and traditions from which one may derive ethical and spiritual inspiration. He regards the theory of evolution as entirely consistent with the unfoldment of God's ultimate plan and purpose. He makes the church an instrument for social reform and ethical teaching, rejects dogma, and emphasizes reason rather than revelation. Modernism finds its greatest following in the cities, where the stimulation of numerous sects and creeds works for a tolerance bordering on indifference.*

* Significant of the modernist influence is the fact that in an aggregate of forty-one sermons delivered in New York churches on September 22, 1929, the word "sin" was used only once. The Rev. Dr. Don O. Shelton, president of the National Bible Institute, in commenting on this said: "The omission of 'sin' from the Christian preachers' messages is astounding in view of the fact that 'sin' is a central word in the vocabulary of the Bible, in which it appears 416 times." See N. Y. *Times*, Septmber 30, 1929. The New York East Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in April, 1930, voiced its approval of birth

However much Protestants may differ among themselves, they look upon the Roman Catholic Church as a common foe. "Their ideas of Catholicism," says Winifred Garrison, "are compounded of an inherited prejudice and a number of vague impressions: a sense of ignorant masses and a domineering heirarchy, mostly foreign and of doubtful morals; a rumor of unintelligible things said and sung, tunelessly, in an unintelligible tongue; . . . people telling everything to their priest; priests telling the people how they must act, think, vote; . . . above all, the Pope, a man who claims to be God for all practical purposes, but most of whose predecessors in office have been bad examples for the young."

Protestantism is democratic, reformist, and nationalistic; Catholicism is authoritarian, non-reformist, and international. The ancient conflict between these two faiths is still the most significant aspect of American religious life.

The Catholic Church in America is an urban church, its main strength being among the immigrant population of the cities, whereas the Protestant Church is largely composed of rural and small-town native Americans. Sixty-five per cent of the churchgoers in cities of 350,000 or more are Catholics. Three-fourths of the Catholics in America reside in cities of 25,000 or more, where they constitute from one-half to two-thirds of the churchgoing population. The native rural American is intensely patriotic, has a deep suspicion of the city and the "foreign element," and consequently regards the Catholic Church as alien and un-American.

What specifically do Protestants think of Catholics? A survey conducted in 1927 in a small Connecticut town by the

control and its disapproval of military training. See N. Y. *World*, April 8, 1930.

Commonweal, a Catholic publication, revealed that an overwhelming proportion of the Protestants would refuse to marry a Catholic, vote for a Catholic for President, or approve the selection of one for the Supreme Court. A majority said they would hesitate to employ a Catholic as nurse for their children, as a guardian, as private secretary, or as a member of the school board. They expressed willingness, however, to pray with a Catholic, approve one as a schoolteacher or librarian, select one as Fourth of July orator, and to have one as an intimate friend. Practically all were willing to recognize Catholics as Christians. A large majority expressed disapproval of the "Ku Klux Klan," "parochial schools," "nuns," and "confessionals." A majority disapproved "Knights of Columbus," "holy orders," "crucifix," "His Holiness," "High Mass," "Inquisition," and "Vatican." Most of them agreed that "Catholics are too superstitious," "that they deny the validity of marriages between Catholics and Protestants," that "they sell consolations for the dead at a price," that "they do not admit the direct approach of the believer to God," that "they are clannish and stick together against Protestants in politics and business," and that "they put the will of the Pope above conscience." It is reassuring to learn that there was unanimous disbelief "that Catholic Church cellars are filled with rifles" and "that Catholics hope to establish the Pope in Washington."

But the attitude of the Connecticut Protestants is more liberal than one finds in the fundamentalist South and Middle West. A few illustrations from the *Fellowship Forum,* organ of this group, which boasts over a million readers, shows the opinions held by a large section of fundamen-

talists. Here one reads that "Papal Superstition and Vice That Caused Death of the Martyrs Is Still Taught," "The Vatican Demands the Destruction of the Methodist College in Rome and the Suppression of Protestantism," "Romanist Admits Hierarchy Seeks to Unite Church and State in America," and that the "Roman Hierarchy Is a Bitter Foe of Public Education." One reader wrote to the editor as follows: "What would it be necessary for a true American to do in order to be in position to tolerate Roman Catholicism? The way I see it, one would have to first dethrone Christ, and make the Pope Vice-Gerent, nullify the Bible, crucify Christ anew and put Him to open shame, with the debauched Pope as Vicar, and surrender all rights, religious, political, educational, and social, to the dictates and domination of an ecclesiastical religio-political machine governed by the Pope of Rome."

The type of literature offered to the readers of the *Fellowship Forum* may be illustrated by the following quotations from a full-page advertisement appearing in a recent issue. The titles of some of the books offered are indicative of their contents. *Free Love in the Vatican — An Authentic Story of the Illicit Love Affairs of the Popes and Their Mistresses*, is one title. Others are: *Proof of Rome's Political Meddling in America, The Italian Pope's Campaign against the Constitutional Rights of American Citizens, Maria Monk — Convent Crimes*, and *Is There a Roman Catholic Peril?*

The attitude of Catholics toward education, marriage, prohibition, and papal authority gives some semblance of truth to the foregoing rabid charges. The Catholic Church is not and never has been an enthusiastic supporter of public secular education. It is perhaps no mere coincidence that

those countries in which the Catholic Church has enjoyed its greatest power and influence are the ones with the highest rate of illiteracy. According to the present canons of the Church, "Catholic children shall not attend non-Catholic or undenominational schools, nor schools that are mixed (that is to say, open also to non-Catholics). The Bishop of the diocese alone has the right, in harmony with the instructions of the Holy See, to decide under what circumstances, and with what safeguards against perversion, the attendance of such schools by Catholic children may be tolerated." * It must not be understood that Catholics in general are opposed to public education. Where possible, however, they prefer to send their own children to parochial schools.

The Catholic Church looks upon marriage as a sacrament to be administered solely by the Church. Dr. S. Woywod in his *Commentary on the Revised Code of the Canon Law* says that since marriage is a sacrament, one is compelled to "admit the necessary and logical conclusion that the Church alone, to the exclusion of all secular powers, has jurisdiction over the marriage contract of Christians." Furthermore, he says, "the Church claims exclusive jurisdiction over the marriage contract and marital state of Christians. . . . Those marriages only are valid which are contracted either before a pastor or the local Ordinary or a priest delegated by either and at least two witnesses." The possibility of conflict is admitted. "As the civil governments of today do not,

* In the encyclical of Pope Pius XI under date of January 16, 1930, the supremacy of the Church in education was reaffirmed. "In the first place," says the Pope, "education belongs preëminently to the Church. . . . It follows as a natural consequence that the Church is independent of earthly sovereignty both in origin and the exercise of its educational mission, not only with respect to its specific aim, but also with respect to the means necessary to achieve it."

as a rule, admit the right of the Church to regulate the marriage contract and marital state by her laws, and they legislate on marriage independently of the Church, there is thus a conflict between the two sets of laws."

It is not true that the Catholics regard all marriages contracted outside the Church as "adulterous unions," but it is not difficult to understand, in view of the foregoing, why the notion that Catholics do so believe should be held by many Protestants.

Prohibition, which was put into the Constitution largely through the efforts of the Protestant evangelical churches, is another source of conflict. By and large, Catholics regard the law as iniquitous. Practically all Catholic editors are opposed to it. It is significant that the cities which are overwhelmingly Catholic are the wet strongholds and that the wet candidate for President in the campaign of 1928 was a New York Catholic. Such a combination invariably raises in the minds of rural fundamentalists all the old stereotypes and bogeys associated with "rum, Romanism, and rebellion."

There is a widespread belief among Protestants that the allegiance which Catholics owe to the Pope conflicts with their allegiance to the United States. A good deal of the political opposition to Catholics is based on this belief. What is the foundation for it? In his Encyclical Letter of December 23, 1922, Pope Pius XI said: "The divine origin and nature of Our power, as well as the sacred right of the community of the faithful scattered throughout the world, require that this sacred power should be independent of all human authority, should not be subject to human laws." According to the *Catholic Encyclopedia*, "The Church has

the right to govern her subjects wherever found, declaring for them moral right and wrong, restricting any such use of their rights as might jeopardize their eternal welfare. . . . In case of direct contradiction, making it impossible for both jurisdictions to be exercised, the jurisdiction of the Church prevails, and that of the State is excluded." Just how far the Church has used or would use this power it is impossible to say — but it lends support to the Protestant claim that "Catholics are subject to an alien rule."

It is natural for Protestants to resent the claims of Catholics that theirs is the only true religion. In the Papal Encyclical issued January 6, 1928, the Pope said: "It is only the Catholic Church that retains the true worship. It is the fountain of truth, it is the household of the faith, it is the temple of God, so that if anyone does not enter it or if anyone departs from it, he is a stranger to the hope of life and salvation." Such delusions of grandeur are irritating to any non-Catholic, and especially so to Protestants suffering from similar delusions concerning their own faith.

The intolerant and ignorant attitude of the fundamentalist Protestants toward modern science has been a popular theme for critics of that faith. But the Protestants have no monopoly on uncomprehending intolerance. In a recent sermon in Boston Cardinal O'Connell denounced the latest theory of Professor Albert Einstein as "false in its deductions . . . and atheistic in its tendencies." In a subsequent letter to the Boston *Evening American*, he said that it was "Einstein's purpose to destroy the basis of Christian faith, [and] behind the cloak of the Einstein theory of relativity and space time, as vaguely enunciated by him, lies the ghastly spectre of atheism." Would Cardinal O'Connell and the Catholics for

whom he speaks outlaw the teaching of Einstein in the schools and universities if they gained control of the state legislature of Massachusetts? It is not inconceivable. Maynard Shipley in *The War on Modern Science* says that "in spite of the views of certain Roman Catholic priests and laymen, and in spite of the rather liberal attitude of the *Catholic Encyclopedia*, the majority of Catholic priests seems to be opposed to the teaching of evolution and most of the adherents of the Church would probably vote for an anti-evolution law."

No discussion of public opinion can overlook the part which the organized churches play in politics. When the political state legislates concerning marriage, education, and public morals, it is to be expected that the churches shall make known their convictions on these matters and seek to influence public policy. The Protestant evangelical churches maintain an elaborate lobby at Washington, backed by an extremely well-organized machine throughout the country, to see that prohibition and other "moral laws" are enacted and enforced. A recent writer describing their activities says: "Already the most potent influence brought to bear upon the national and state government is that of six Protestant denominations, representing thirteen million communicants, leagued together for the purpose of making the will of the Church the will of the people." The influence of the Methodist Board of Temperance, Prohibition, and Public Morals, the W. C. T. U., the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, and others is too well known to need discussion here.

In the Presidential election of 1928 the religious issue burned with white heat. Governor Smith offended the mili-

tant Protestants because he was a wet and a Catholic. Many Protestants openly declared their opposition to him on both grounds, and were denounced as intolerant and bigoted. They were accused of violating a basic principle of our Constitution — the separation of Church and State.

Since a good deal of this criticism came from Catholics, defending Smith from unjust and irrelevant attacks, it may be well to inquire into the attitude of Catholics toward politics. During the 1928 campaign many Catholic leaders did not scruple to appeal to religious sympathies in their desire to have Smith elected. The *Missionary*, official organ of the Catholic Missionary Union, said in its issue of October, 1928: "This campaign has been intensely significant to Catholics because it is so plainly part of our Divine Lord's own age-long and world-wide campaign. . . .

"With this in view is it any wonder that all Catholic lovers of Christ are feverishly praying for Governor Smith's success? Have you ever thought what life in the United States will mean when it becomes the fashion — the rage to be Catholic? . . . Watch and see, America is going to become pro-Catholic all at once. . . . We should be charitable enough to take no notice of the change, forget America was ever anti-Catholic, and carry on as if we had always been, all of us, loyal children of Holy Church.

"This change may take place early in the administration of Governor Smith as President."

Another editorial, in the *Union and Times*, official organ of the Diocese of Buffalo, New York, in its issue of October 4, 1928, said in part: "The Protestant Church in the United States has existed upon the unestablished fact that this is a Protestant country. It has clung to this fallacy like a drown-

ing man to a straw. It has hoodwinked its members into believing it and it has bellowed the statement so loud that many Catholics have accepted it without proof.

"Were a Catholic elected tomorrow the drowning man, in the person of the Protestant Church, would quickly sink from view."

According to a report of the Administrative Committee of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, "The National Headquarters keeps in direct personal touch with the officials of the Government from the President and Cabinet members to members of Congress." This organization on January 19, 1921, sent out a letter asking Catholics to protest against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill to establish a Federal Department of Education. The letter said in part:

"You are doubtless familiar with the efforts we have made during the past two years to accomplish the defeat of the bill. . . . We are communicating with over five thousand societies of Catholic men to urge . . . that they be prepared upon notice from us to wire their Congressmen as societies and to have individual members and friends of members . . . also wire protests to their political representatives in Washington." *

Many people regard the political activities of the Church as inconsistent with its true mission. They would keep the pulpit free from politics. But, as the author has stated elsewhere, "life cannot be so rigidly categorized. Business,

* In its issue of February 16, 1929, the liberal Catholic journal *America* declared: "In any state where birth-control legislation is pending, our opposition should not be restricted to indignation privately expressed, but should be conveyed to the legislature and, particularly, to the members of the committee which has the bill in charge. . . . The average legislator is not greatly moved by reasons based on ethics or the natural law, but he is not anxious to offend his constituents."

religion, club life, politics are not so many distinct entities. They are parts of a full social personality. To say that . . . religious groups shall not take an active part in politics is to say that they shall have no voice in the determination of the legal arrangements governing their own lives." *

More Christian charity might be displayed by the churches in their relations with one another. The present conflicts between modernists and fundamentalists, between Protestants and Catholics, reminds one forcibly of the remark made by T. P. O'Conner: "Ireland," he said, "is in a devil of a way. Down here we have the Catholics, and up there we have the Protestants, and they're at each other's throats all the time." After a pause he concluded: "I often wish they were all of them heathen, so they could live together like Christians."

* As the Rev. Dr. Charles E. Jefferson declared in a sermon preached at the Broadway Tabernacle, October 27, 1929: "We ought to mix religion and politics. What is religion worth if it is not mixed with life? Our political life is of tremendous importance, and if religion and politics are not mixed, politics becomes rotten and religion a superstition." — N. Y. *Times*, October 28, 1929.

Chapter IV

THE PILLARS OF SOCIETY

2. The School

With the rapid decline in the stability and importance of the family, the school has come into the foreground as a basic factor in molding public opinion. The little red schoolhouse has long been a symbol of American democracy. It has been called the "birthplace of true patriotism, cradle of liberty, doorway of hope, avenue of opportunity, foundation of character, and defender of our free institutions." However exaggerated this may be, the importance of the school in forming opinion cannot be denied. "Civilization," says H. G. Wells, "is a race between education and catastrophe." Upon the school rests the burden of this education to a greater extent than ever before in history.

There are in the United States some 30,000,000 persons between the ages of 5 and 17. Over 25,000,000, or almost 90 per cent of these, are enrolled in elementary, secondary, and high schools. More than five billion dollars' worth of public property is devoted to education, and our total annual expenditures run well over two billion dollars. About 900,000 teachers are employed, three-fourths of whom are women.

In spite of this gigantic outpouring of energy and wealth upon our school system, we have not yet succeeded in wiping

out illiteracy. Five million persons over ten years of age in the United States (about 6 per cent of the total) can neither read nor write. Almost 23 per cent of our Negro population over ten years of age is illiterate, and over 13 per cent of the foreign-born white. Illiteracy varies from 1.1 per cent in Iowa to 23 per cent in Louisiana. These figures stand in shameful contrast to those of such countries as Denmark with two-tenths of one per cent illiterate, Switzerland with three-tenths of one per cent, Germany with three-hundredths of one per cent, and England and Wales with 1.8 per cent. The opinions and attitudes of illiterates cannot be influenced by the printed page. They are derived chiefly from tradition and gossip. An illiterate population constitutes a standing menace to democracy.

The most important factor in the educational process is the teaching staff. Three-fourths of the teachers in American elementary and high schools are unmarried women. It is not unjust to say that the majority of them "go into teaching" as a stop-gap between marriage or "something better." According to a bulletin of the National Education Association, one-fourth of the teachers in our elementary schools serve two years or less, and half of them serve less than five years. Their salaries are low. The average yearly salary of approximately 160,000 teachers in rural one-room schools is less than $800. In our city schools the pay is only slightly higher. A survey of 359 cities in 1920 showed that over half of the male elementary teachers were receiving less than $1,262 a year, and the pay of women was even smaller. Dr. J. K. Denberg, examiner for the New York Board of Education, says that as a result of this situation "The teacher of culture is leaving the system, and no new men or women of

culture are entering to take his or her place." Capable men who hope to marry and have families are precluded from entering the profession of teaching in our elementary schools; these positions are being filled increasingly by women. From 1880 to 1924 the percentage of men teachers fell from 42.8 to 16.8. Under these circumstances it has been virtually impossible to develop high standards.*

One is constantly hearing the lament that the "teaching profession is not honored and respected as it should be," and teachers suffer from a pronounced inferiority complex. This feeling is in part the cause and in part the result of inferior persons being allowed to teach. The profession is overloaded with incompetents, who lend at least a semblance of truth to the charge that "those who can, *do*, and those who can't, *teach*." At a teachers' meeting in 1852 the question was raised as to why teachers were not as highly respected as lawyers, doctors, and ministers. In the course of the discussion Susan B. Anthony placed her finger on at least one important reason. "It seems to me," she said, "that you fail to comprehend the cause of the disrespect of which you complain. Do you not see that so long as society says that woman has not brains enough to be a doctor, a lawyer, or a minister, but has plenty to be a teacher, every one of you

* The average annual salary of teachers, including supervisors and principals, in 1924 was $1,227. There is considerable variation from state to state. In Georgia the average salary in 1924 was $577; whereas in New York it was $1,942. Salaries in the city schools are of course higher than in the rural districts. According to a bulletin of the National Education Association median salaries of elementary-school teachers in cities in 1928-29 were as follows:

67 cities with over 100,000 population	$2,056
170 cities with 30,000 to 100,000 population	$1,582
308 cities with 10,000 to 30,000 population	$1,415
342 cities with 5,000 to 10,000 population	$1,342
574 cities with 2,500 to 5,000 population	$1,212

who condescends to teach tacitly admits before all Israel and the sun that he has no more brains than a woman?" The teaching profession suffers because of the traditionally inferior position which women have occupied.

The consequences, in a Puritan country, of placing unmarried women and girls in charge of our youngsters are more far-reaching than merely lowering the economic and social standing of the teaching profession. To put a highly repressed spinster or a romantic girl in charge of a group of adolescents is of doubtful wisdom. Emotionally starved, they lead but "half lives" and convey to the pupils either directly or by suggestion, their own distorted attitudes. To some extent the American attitude toward sex is the result of this situation. Sex education, which is neglected almost universally in the American home, is not a subject with which these ladies are prepared to deal.*

Many educators believe that the attitude of married teachers toward school children is more healthful. But in the United States to be married is an almost insurmountable obstacle to appointment. Learned and Bagley in a recent study of the training and qualifications of teachers say: "It is a widespread practice among American school boards to consider a woman teacher's marriage as equivalent to resignation." One important reason for this policy is the belief among taxpayers that a teaching position is a proper perquisite for needy citizens. There are many communities where a taxpayer with unmarried daughters expects as a matter of right that they will be "taken care of" by the

* Dr. M. J. Exner's study of the sources of sex information among American boys shows that a majority of them get their first permanent impressions about sex before the age of twelve from older playmates or vulgar-minded adults.

school board until they marry. The educational system thus becomes a gigantic public charity.* Where there are more applicants than jobs, as is pretty generally the case, a system of "rotation in office" is adopted, or the jobs go to those with the most political "pull." One cause of Superintendent McAndrew's unpopularity in Chicago was his refusal to appoint teachers on the behest of politicians. The degrading influence of such practices upon the public schools is evident.

The average American would hesitate to entrust the conduct of his business or the running of his automobile to people who know little or nothing of either. Yet he will entrust his children to so-called teachers almost wholly devoid of adequate training. A large proportion of our elementary-school teachers have had no training beyond the elementary grades, and nearly half have never completed a high-school course. At best they are effective police officers who supervise the behavior of the child for a few hours each day, or at worst they are witch doctors filling the child's mind with their own mental mirages.

There has been some effort in recent years to raise standards. According to a recent *Review of Educational Legislation* by the Federal Bureau of Education, 1924, "the standards which the states, by legislation and otherwise, are working toward is high-school training plus two years of

* Inspector Edward H. Williams of Detroit expressed the traditional attitude when in January, 1930, he proposed the dismissal from the Detroit public schools of all married teachers. "Married women," he said, "whose husbands should be supporting them, are holding hundreds of teaching positions. . . . With the President of the country, the governor, and the mayor all taking active steps at this time to relieve present employment conditions, I believe the board of education should coöperate at least to the extent of weeding out those married teachers who should be at home." In eleven states, however, married teachers are protected by permanent tenure statutes.

normal-school training for every teacher in the elementary schools. *But as yet this standard has been attained in but a few states.*" *

There are in the United States some 382 normal schools and colleges for the training of teachers. The character of instruction offered in these institutions does not lead one to be optimistic over the prospect of raising standards by forcing teachers through their regimen. The emphasis, in most of these schools, is on methods of teaching, educational measurements, and school administration. Very little effort is made to give the student ideas, information, or inspiration. He comes out with little or no more education than he had at the beginning. The *form* is given, but the *substance* is denied. All that is required of the student here, says T. N. Gillespie, is that he be "well versed in the art and science of System and Supervision, able to spout soaring streams of talk about Education's Great Service and the Need for More and Better Educational Research, and capable finally of producing at all times a great quantity of mysterious charts and

* The requirements for elementary teaching certificates in the United States are given in a *Manual of Educational Legislation*, 1926, issued by the United States Bureau of Education.

	Number of States
Examination only (no academic or professional training required)	15
Examination and a minimum amount of academic training but less than graduation from high school	2
Minimum academic training less than high-school graduation and six to eighteen weeks' professional training	2
Graduation from high school	2
Graduation from high school and examination	5
High-school graduation and professional training of from nine weeks to two years	14
High-school graduation, professional study, and examination	8

We cannot refrain from quoting in this connection Professor E. L. Thorndike, who says: "A nation which lets incapables teach it, while the capable men and women only feed, clothe, or amuse it, is committing intellectual suicide."

graphs, with zigzag and multicolored curves, and endless strings of statistics showing modes, medians, averages, percentiles, and probable errors." Concerning Shakspere he need know little or nothing if he can produce a chart showing the *mean* for the appreciation of Elizabethan tragedy.

It is not our purpose to cast ridicule upon this form of instruction. It is undoubtedly helpful in meeting many of the problems which the teacher will encounter in the classroom. But it would seem that a speaking acquaintance with social and political history, the great works of literature, philosophy, and science, a knowledge of the history and psychology of religion, would constitute at least as important a part of the teacher's equipment as to know whether it is better to stand or sit while teaching.

The most important tests applied in the selection of teachers are those which may be termed moral and political. On the whole, school boards are more concerned with a teacher's morals than with her mind. Do you smoke? If so, you will have a hard time getting a job in California, New Jersey, Tennessee, Urbana (Illinois), or Lynn (Massachusetts). In Los Angeles no man who smokes may receive a teaching certificate. Bobbed hair is regarded by many boards as a sign of immorality. Many contracts compel the teacher to agree to "no dates," "no petting," "no short skirts." The following from a North Carolina town is illustrative:

> I promise to take a vital interest in all phases of Sunday-school work, donating of my time, service, and money without stint for the benefit and uplift of the community.
>
> I promise to abstain from dancing, immodest dressing, and any other conduct unbecoming a teacher and a lady.
>
> I promise not to go out with any young man except in so far as it may be necessary to stimulate Sunday-school work. [Sic!]

I promise not to fall in love, to become engaged or secretly married.

I promise to remain in the dormitory or on the school grounds when not actively engaged in school or church work elsewhere.

I promise not to encourage or tolerate the least familiarity on the part of any of my boy pupils.

I promise to sleep eight hours a night, to eat carefully, etc., etc.

Not all boards go to such absurd lengths, but virtually all make a careful inquiry concerning the applicant's most private and personal affairs.* The result is that for a teacher to get a job she must confess to being either a nincompoop or a hypocrite. Since the pressure for jobs is becoming great, the best teachers are forced into the latter category. They must conform to the standard prejudices or join the army of unemployed. If it is necessary to join the Ku Klux Klan or to be a Methodist or a Baptist, the teacher seeking a position will cut her moral cloak to fit. "The strongest recommendation a teacher can have for most jobs in Minnesota," says Thomas Minehan, "is to be a Scandinavian. Many teachers are selected because they happen to be of the same nationality or religious faith as the superintendent." To be a Jew or a Catholic outside some of our larger cities is sufficient to disqualify an applicant regardless of his or her intellectual attainments.

* A teacher's contract in Mississippi states: "No teacher is expected to attend dances at home or away when in the employ of this board." In Ottawa, Kansas, in June, 1929, eleven teachers were dismissed because they had gone to a dance at a country club in violation of a school-board rule. In one Ohio county, teachers who "go with" other teachers are dropped.

"How," asks a writer in the *Atlantic* for March, 1930, "can teachers train children to be independent and self-reliant in mind and body if they are themselves hedged about with so great a variety of moral scruples and suspicious rules?"

Equally important is a complete freedom from any ideas which border on the unusual or the radical. Most school boards are not looking for teachers who can lead, but for instructors who will convey to the rising generation the humdrum habits of the existing order. "Any teacher," says Minehan, "suspected of being a radical is never retained longer than it takes for the board to meet."

This concern for the political and economic opinions of teachers is not new. During and following the Civil War there was an outburst of state legislation requiring teachers to subscribe to loyalty oaths and pledges of political orthodoxy. Kentucky led the way in 1862, to be followed by West Virginia, Missouri, Arkansas, Oregon, and Arizona. The spirit in which this legislation was enacted is graphically illustrated in a report by the state commissioner of education to the general assembly of Rhode Island in 1865. "The war tocsin has sounded," he said, "our country is convulsed in a mighty conflict, our friends are in the contesting field, their blood has been made to redden and fertilize the rebel soil. . . . Traitors and rebel sympathizers are among us. . . . Therefore let us be on our guard lest some of them unawares be ushered into our schools as teachers. . . . Shall the hand already stained with the blood of the murdered father be employed to guide his orphan child? . . . Better by far remain as he is, his untutored mind wrapped up in ignorance. . . . But let our teachers be noble, loyal sons and daughters of America — those who, while instructing our little ones in the sciences that pertain to the secular concerns of life will also teach them their obligations to their country, and at the same time will point them to *that never fading star* by which their frail barks may be safely guided over

life's treacherous seas to the port of eternal rest, to gain that blood-washed throng who chant the praises of God and the Lamb from Mount Zion's balmy top." *

Under the Lusk laws adopted in 1917 by the legislature of New York, every teacher was required to give evidence of "good moral character." No teaching certificate was to be issued to "any person who . . . has advocated, either by word of mouth or by writing, a change in the form of government of the United States or of this State, by force, violence, or any unlawful means." The purpose of the law was to "weed out radicals and other undesirables" from the schools. Similar laws were subsequently adopted in Ohio, Michigan, West Virginia, Tennessee, Oklahoma, Nebraska, South Dakota, Nevada, Idaho, Montana, and Washington. Happily the Lusk laws in New York were repealed in 1923. After the war, teachers' certificates were revoked in many states for failure to impress upon the minds of the pupils "the principles of patriotism or to train them up to a true comprehension of the rights, duty, and dignity of American citizenship." The laws of South Dakota and Washington revoked the certificates of teachers who "have publicly reviled, ridiculed, or otherwise spoken or acted with disrespect and contumely towards the flag of the United States or its official uniforms or insignia or towards the system of government of the United States and its Constitution."

Anyone who reads the daily press must know that this sort of thing has not ceased. On November 11, 1926, a report was submitted to the board of education of New York City, explaining why one Abraham Lefkowitz, a teacher in the city schools, was refused promotion. Lefkowitz was one

* B. Pierce, *Public Opinion and the Teaching of History*, p. 33.

of three who, because of their radicalism, failed of promotion. Associate Superintendent Edward Mandel, speaking of Lefkowitz, said that he "is a master of the technique of teaching — he knows how to present his subject and arouse and hold the interest of his pupils. No doubt he has a thorough knowledge of his subject matter. *But that is not enough. Technique and knowledge are no substitutes for the spiritual enrichment and inoculation of American ideals, which are the primary aims in teaching history and civics.*" [Italics mine.] That is to say, the teacher's primary job is to inoculate the students with the ideals of the herd. In April, 1927, the Liberal Club at West Chester Pennsylvania State Normal School was suppressed, and two professors were dismissed for radicalism. The dismissals were made at the instance of the American Legion because these professors presumed "in a tax-supported school to criticize the acts of our government."

Since most teachers serve under year-to-year contracts, their tenure depends upon the good will of the board. The result is, as a writer in the *New Republic* recently said, that "with a few outstanding exceptions teachers are becoming the most tight-lipped and timorous creatures of any profession in the country." The situation was described in the *Columbus Dispatch* of July 3, 1929, as follows: "Teachers should know that it is part of American educational tradition that a teacher should have little or no freedom. She is born to be suppressed and harassed by a system of supervision designed to keep her docile."

The control of the public schools in the United States is lodged with school boards and superintendents of education. A majority of the state boards are appointed by the gov-

ernors of the several states. Over 60 per cent of the county boards and about 80 per cent of the city boards are popularly elected. A majority of the county and state superintendents are popularly elected, although this method of selection has been abandoned in most cities. Where popular election is the rule, the successful candidate is usually the man or woman who can most effectively appeal to the standard stereotypes of the crowd.

Professor George Counts in 1927 published a careful analysis of the social composition of sixteen hundred boards of education. Summarizing his findings, we find that the typical county board is composed of six members popularly elected. The single woman member is a housewife, three of the men are farmers, one is a merchant, and one is a physician. Three of the members have had no education beyond the elementary grades, one has attended high school, and two have been to college. The typical city board of six members includes one woman. Of the five men, one is a merchant, one a lawyer, one a physician, one a business man, and one a salesman, clerk, or laborer. A majority of them have attended high school or college. The typical state board of six members, appointed by the governor, includes a housewife, the state superintendent of education, a superintendent of schools, a university president, the secretary of state, and a merchant or banker.

In short, the control of education is in the hands of the dominant social and economic classes. This means that school boards are invariably conservative and tend to exaggerate the merits of the existing order. As Professor Counts says, "History tells us that the dominant forces of any age rarely extend the hand of welcome to their successors. To

the degree, therefore, that the school is under the control of these forces, however benevolent they may appear, the chances are that its face will be turned toward the past. Its function will be defensive and conservative rather than creative and progressive."

The laboring classes feel particularly aggrieved at this situation. "It is exceptional," says James H. Maurer, of the Pennsylvania State Federation of Labor, "to find an opportunity in the established schools for free and open discussion of the social and economic questions that are of vital interest to workingmen. . . . Yet in the same schools the chamber of commerce, the American Legion, and similar organizations can send representatives at any time to talk to the students on any subject." *

The school is part and parcel of community life. It cannot be isolated from the influence of special-interest groups who seek to instil their own ideas in the young people of the nation. As George Counts says in his excellent study *School and Society in Chicago*, "The educational system unceasingly feels the impact of the Association of Commerce, the Federation of Labor, the Woman's City Club, the religious sects, the city hall, the daily press, and a host of other groups, agencies, and organizations." These groups are but remotely, if at all, interested in the truth. Education, if they had their way, and they frequently do, would consist of inoculating the students with ideas favorable to their own special interests.

* A similar analysis of the personnel of school boards in 104 cities, with populations of forty thousand or more, was made by Scott Nearing and published in *School and Society* for January, 1917. Mr. Nearing found that "Five occupational groups include the bulk of board members — merchants, manufacturers, bankers, brokers and real-estate men, doctors and lawyers — 588 out of a total of 967 board members." The total number of teachers on the boards in these cities was 18.

The recent investigation of public utility propaganda by the Federal Trade Commission reveals the extent to which big business influences the teaching in our public schools. Seeking to offset the trend toward government ownership of the electrical industry, these interests have made a concerted effort to introduce into the schools their own special brand of economics and political science. B. J. Mullaney, director of the Illinois Committee on Public Utility Information, boasted that three-fourths of the high schools of Illinois used literature prepared by his committee. The success of the Illinois committee led to similar efforts in Indiana, Ohio, Kentucky, Missouri, Arkansas, Nebraska, Oklahoma, Michigan, Wisconsin, Iowa, Texas, California, and New York. Fred Bollmeyer, of the Ohio committee, testified that over two hundred thousand students in the public and private schools of that state were using *Aladdins of Industry*, a textbook prepared by the utilities. In Michigan more than ten thousand specially prepared utility pamphlets were distributed to the public schools. In Connecticut a *Public Utilities Catechism* was put into 70 per cent of the lower schools. The nature of the "instruction" given by this literature may be illustrated by a few quotations. In the Connecticut *Catechism*, for example, occurs the following: "It has been found in every case that the costs of the service are higher [under municipal ownership] than when the service is furnished by a private corporation." Furthermore the *Catechism* says that "The cost of living in cities that operate their own utilities is much higher." In the textbook, *Aladdins of Industry*, used in the schools of Ohio, occurs this astounding declaration: "Under the prevailing system of regulation they [the public utility companies] can make no profits in the

sense other businesses do." The underlying purpose of this instruction, according to George B. Cortelyou, chairman of the Joint Committee of National Utility Associations, is "to demonstrate that the entry of the government, whether national, state, or local, into this field is constitutionally unsafe, politically unwise, economically unsound, and competitively unfair." It is needless to say that the literature "demonstrating these basic truths" is distributed free of charge.

J. W. Crabtree, secretary of the National Education Association, denounced the utilities for these activities, saying: "these utility service bureaus have attempted to carry out the definite purpose of getting propaganda into the schools; . . . they used their influence through school channels and through publishers of textbooks to force changes in texts satisfactory to their purpose." In conclusion Mr. Crabtree made the following significant statement: "Owing to the power of these agencies in some localities and states it may be unwise and dangerous for a given educator to raise his voice against what is going on, but there is no such handicap on the actions of this association as a whole."

But the public utilities are not the only organizations seeking to control the schools. Since its organization in 1904 the Chicago Association of Commerce has had, on the average, three or four of its members on the school board, the total membership of which is eleven. Its publications circulate freely in the schools. The Commercial Club of that city has always maintained an active interest in what is taught. A member of its educational committee wrote in 1913: "The increase of socialism can be minimized by a vocational training which will increase the intelligence and

further the earning power of our children. It is not difficult to inculcate the fundamental principles of industrial economics in an elementary way, and it does not require a mature mind to comprehend that . . . wealth can only be produced by the joint effort of capital and labor, that there will always be a difference in individual character and ability, and that no social plan can be maintained that goes contrary to these basic truths." Vocational education and the Commercial High School were established through the influence of these groups, not only to "stem the tide of socialism" but to provide adequately trained mechanics, stenographers, and bookkeepers. The annual Clean-Up-Paint-Up-Plant-Up campaign in the Chicago schools was inaugurated at the instance of the nursery interests, the Paint Dealers' Association, and the Paint, Oil, and Varnish Club, to promote the sale of their products.*

The activities of super-patriotic groups in education would require a volume to describe. The National Security League boasts that through its efforts over forty states require instruction in the Constitution. According to the League's own statement the purpose of this instruction is to teach the children the necessity for "an adequate army, national guard, and reserve force," to acquaint them with the "rights, advantages, and blessings, surpassing all others, secured to the citizen in our system of government," and "insistence upon the duty and wisdom of having a good army and navy to meet aggressions from without, and good Constitutional instruction to RESIST FOOLISH SUBVERSIVE

* The report of the committee of the National Education Association on Propaganda in the Schools, 1929, shows that few school systems in America are free from these influences. See also "Social Forces Affecting the Curriculum," by H. C. Lehman and Paul Witty, *Educational Review*, February, 1928.

CHANGES IN A GOVERNMENT that has proven so successful." According to the American Bar Association, which also has been active in this connection, the purpose of such instruction should be "to stem the tide of radical, and often treasonable attacks upon our Constitution" and to combat "the socialistic tendencies taught in many of our schools and colleges." In 1924 the committee of the Bar Association on American Citizenship declared that "the schools of America should no more consider graduating a student who lacks faith in our government than a school of theology should graduate a minister who lacks faith in God." According to the American Legion, courses in civics and history should "inspire the children with patriotism . . . preserve the legends, encourage faith, [and] emphasize effort and success, not failure."

The Chicago *Tribune*, which until recently carried on its masthead the motto "My Country Right or Wrong," was deeply incensed in 1926 upon discovering that unpatriotic ideas were being taught in Chicago schools. The object of its wrath was a history syllabus for eighth graders. Among the topics suggested for discussion in the syllabus were, "The Soldier's Life in Trench and Dugout," "The Boredom of the Training Camp," "The Futility of War," "How Great Armaments Invite War." On January 14, the *Tribune* fulminated under the title "Pacifist Borers in the Schools": "An American school history course has been perverted to teach children that military training is boredom and that life in a trench is perilous and in a dugout hideous. . . . The purpose of this teaching is to destroy the qualities which service men needed. . . . The boring in which the pacifists are doing in the schools and colleges is . . . in about equal

parts impertinence, absurdity, and malevolence." On February 22 the *Tribune* was able to report victory, declaring that its exposé "has disclosed the real facts about pacifism in the schools and brought about a housecleaning." Mayor Thompson's campaign against so-called pro-English textbooks is but another illustration of the same thing. It was by no means an exceptional or isolated instance. It is significant that his promise to "sock King George on the snoot" and to see that "red-blooded Americanism" is taught in the schools won him many votes.

There is pressure also from Labor organizations, who want the young indoctrinated with the dogmas of the "class struggle," and Catholic groups opposed to education which "tends to diminish the consideration that a Catholic child has for the Catholic Church." The Protestants, on the other hand, are alarmed at the manner in which "Rome spreads its insidious propaganda in our schools." The Oregon law which would have compelled all children to attend the public schools was obviously aimed at the Catholics. The Tennessee law of 1925 prohibited "the teaching of the evolution theory in all the universities, normal and all other public schools of Tennessee, which are supported in whole or in part by the public funds of the State." This merely asserts the right of those who pay for the support of the schools to have taught their own beliefs and opinions, however benighted they may be. The fundamentalists of Tennessee pay the piper and they insist upon their right to call the tune. Illustrative of this point of view is the following statement issued in 1927 by the assistant superintendent of schools in Mississippi: "My attention has been called to a statement in a New Orleans paper in which I am quoted as saying that

the anti-evolution law in our state will not be enforced by the State Board of Education.

"I want to deny most emphatically that I authorized any such statement. . . .

"I want the people of Mississippi to know that, as assistant state superintendent of education, I believe in the enforcement of all laws and that so far as the question of evolution is concerned I believe that man was made in the image of God his Creator, and I favor putting out of the schoolroom any man or woman teaching any other doctrine."

To make control more effective, "patriotic groups" are advocating the establishment of a Federal Department of Education. According to Senator Heflin, one of the most enthusiastic backers of such legislation, "It would be the business of the Secretary of Education to know whether un-American doctrine is being taught in the various schools of the country. . . . he should be clothed with authority, in conjunction with the state, to prevent the teaching of un-American doctrine and principles. . . . For instance, one of the most vital principles of our American Government is the separation of Church and State, and yet the Roman Catholic authorities are having taught an opposite doctrine to their children in the parochial schools. . . . And it would be the business of the Secretary of Education to prevent the teaching of that doctrine anywhere in the United States." Out of Tennessee comes a comforting word of protest against these influences. President Bruce R. Payne, of George Peabody College for Teachers, at Nashville, in an address to the teachers of that institution, said that unless the pressure from outside groups ceased, "public education will fall into the hands of political schemers and fanatical propagandists, who

will utilize the machinery of education in carrying forward their own selfish purposes."

Upon the theory that "the taxpayers have a right to decide what shall be taught in the public schools," legislative control of the curriculum has increased markedly in recent years. Three states — Tennessee, Mississippi, and Arkansas — have outlawed the teaching of evolution in schools and colleges supported by public funds. Since 1921 similar legislation has been proposed in the legislatures of thirty-seven other states. In four of these the bills have passed the lower house. Moreover, in Florida, Louisiana, Texas, and Kentucky, all references to evolution have been deleted from the textbooks.

In a study of the *Legislative Control of the Elementary Curriculum*, J. K. Flanders summarizes these legislative prescriptions over a period of years.

Subjects to Be Taught	Number of Prescriptions			Increase		
	1903	1913	1923	1903-1913	1913-1923	1903-1923
Nationalism	147	196	304	49	108	157
Health and Prohibition	102	131	171	29	40	69
Conservation	1	20	43	19	23	42
Practical and Cultural Courses	24	44	59	20	15	35
Humaneness	12	28	36	16	8	24
Fundamental Subjects	137	216	216	19	—	19
Religious and Ethical Subjects	74	76	84	2	8	10
Miscellaneous	7	9	13	2	4	6
	564	720	926	156	206	362

Since 1903 the number of legislative prescriptions has increased over 60 per cent. Under the heading of "Nationalism" come such things as: flag exercises and display, observation of special days, state history and constitution, civil government, Constitution of the United States, citizenship, patriotism. Many states, among them Massachusetts, Delaware, and New Jersey, require the daily reading of the Bible. As one fundamentalist preacher recently said, this is justified because "Any man that does not believe the Bible, including the Book of Genesis, and opposes its being taught in the schools is a traitor to his country."

The setting aside of special days for observance is a favorite requirement. In addition to the regularly observed days, such as New Year's, Christmas, and Thanksgiving, the following days are set aside for special exercises:

	No. States		*No. States*
Lincoln's Birthday	23	Columbus Day	18
Washington's Birthday	32	Temperance Day or Frances Willard Day	13
Arbor Day	29	Armistice Day	20
Memorial Day	28	Admission or State Day	11
Flag Day	8		
Labor Day	22		

Robert E. Lee Day is observed in Arkansas, Georgia, and Virginia; Good Friday in Connecticut and Maryland; Patriots Day in Maine and Massachusetts; the birthday of Jefferson Davis in Texas, as is the Declaration of the Independence of the Texas Republic. Adoption of the Federal Constitution Day is observed in Michigan, as is Roovevelt's birthday; Pioneer Day must be observed in Montana and Utah; Uncle Remus Day in Georgia; and Woodrow Wilson Day in South Carolina.

Twenty-six states require that uniform textbooks be used in the public schools. In selecting these texts, especially in the social sciences,* the boards must be careful not to offend any substantial group in the community. The result is that the books used are conservative in tone and outlook.

A careful analysis of twenty-four history textbooks and an equal number of supplementary readers, which are widely used, was recently published by the Association for Peace Education. The investigation showed that from 20 to 90 per cent of the space in these books is devoted to war and that an overwhelming majority of them are frankly nationalistic in tone. The wars of the United States are pictured as being either self-defensive or altruistic. Little or no space is devoted to a discussion of peace. Although the authors of the study admit that there is "a slight tendency toward improvement in the newer texts," they conclude: "Educators and historians have too long poisoned the mind of the oncoming generations with their glorification of war. The future demands a type of history that will not exaggerate the place of war, which will show its true nature, and which will develop in children the will to peace."

Civics textbooks for the most part are descriptive treatises on the structure of national, state, and local government and tend to emphasize form rather than function. The newer texts are abandoning this formalistic treatment and are giving the student material on immigration, labor problems,

* It is interesting to note in this connection that the amount of time devoted to the social studies has increased from a total of 901 minutes per week in 1888 to 1,499 minutes per week in 1925. In 1904 only 4 per cent of the total time was devoted to history and civics; whereas in 1924 this had increased to 6.2 per cent of the total time. See *Research Bulletin of the National Education Association*, Vol. III, Nos. 4 and 5, September and November, 1925.

international peace, public health, and community welfare. But writers of civics books must be careful not to offend the prejudices of those in control. School boards do not look kindly upon instruction which implies criticism of existing social institutions.

Actual Democracy: The Problems of America, by Margaret Berry and Samuel B. Howe, may serve to illustrate the spirit in which many of the new texts are written. This book is designed for high schools and provides, at the end of each chapter, topics for discussion. For instance, after the chapter on "The Problem of Private Property" the student is asked to "show that private property and democracy are inseparable." In discussing trade unions the authors recognize several types. There is "business unionism which is trade conscious but not class conscious. It is essentially a bargaining and conservative institution." Second is the "friendly or uplift union which . . . favors collective bargaining and profit sharing." There is also "predatory unionism . . . which never combines with the employers, but engages in a secret and violent warfare with capital." Finally there is a "fourth and more objectionable type of unionism," such as that represented by the Western Federation of Miners and the Industrial Workers of the World. "It is class conscious and antagonistic to the wage and other systems of society." The student is told that immigration has resulted in "the growth of radical theories of government, so that today American Democracy is facing a life and death struggle with Marxian socialism."

The Common Sense of the Constitution of the United States, by A. T. Southworth, is another modern text in which the "absurdities" of complete freedom of speech are

demonstrated. The doctrine of anarchy is vividly summed up as "Murder A, throw him out of office, and let me rule."

A third *Textbook in Citizenship*, by R. O. Hughes, is profusely illustrated with pictures supplied by large corporations, showing company Americanization schools, flag-raising exercises, factory gardens, employees of long and faithful service, and those who own company stock. The United States Steel Company, the International Harvester Company, and others are described as "employers of the right sort." Lenin and Trotzky are dismissed as " two able and unscrupulous leaders," and the student is told that "no civilized people can tolerate" anarchists.

Not all civics books are so "stand pat" or reactionary. Many are honest and progressive. But these latter are constantly on the defensive.*

It is obvious that education in America is regarded, not as a means for stimulating in the children a desire to know the truth, but as a means for inoculating them with the stereotypes and superstitions of the dominant groups in control. We have a lock-step system of education. We do not want

* What the community demands in the teaching of civics is illustrated by the following list of the ten most frequently mentioned topics out of a total of 274 mentioned by 593 people "representing the leading professions and vocations."

Topic	*No. Times Mentioned*
Individual duties, responsibilities, and privileges as a citizen	224
Duty to vote	221
Respect and obedience for law	213
Responsibility of the individual to the community	143
Coöperation in community affairs	126
Public health	125
Honesty	122
Government, its principles and purpose	116
Payment of taxes willingly	102
Respect for the rights of others	101

See *Research Bulletin of N. E. A., op. cit.*

citizens, but crowd men. We desire to make not free men but robots, weak and pitiful conformists clinging to the futile phobias of the past. We are making goslings of our children, teaching them to goose-step to the tune of *The Stars and Stripes Forever.**

There are voices in the land demanding a new approach to education. Emphasis is to be laid upon individuality, discussion, learning by doing, student participation in school control, and psychological rather than formalistic learning. Education in internationalism and social responsibility is making some headway. Already, says Charles Beard, there is "a large body of teachers and school administrators who are convinced that the love of truth and the desire to be intelligent are more precious possessions than any segments of bigotry."

No one will deny the necessity of preserving and passing on the social and intellectual heritage of the race. But when this is done at the expense of intellectual independence and social progress, one may well question its value.

Beyond the elementary and high schools are the colleges and universities. With a total enrollment of over nine hundred thousand, they contain the "pick of our coming genera-

* The prevailing theory of public school education in the United States has been ably stated by the school superintendent of an important Massachusetts city in his report for 1928. He says that our school should provide "every normal child with all the knowledge, habits and skills which will reasonably be required of an adult in normal social living. This is the objective of the elementary schools. Little provision for individual differences . . . should be made, for *uniformity of knowledge and behavior is the goal.* [Italics mine.] . . . The excessive individualism of our time constitutes a danger to our social stability. Society has established our educational institutions for its own preservation and enrichment and not for the development of individuals as individuals." — *Thirty-Third Annual Report of the School Department*, City of North Adams, Massachusetts, Nov. 30, 1928.

tion." From them will come in increasing numbers the leaders of American life.

An overwhelming majority of our colleges and universities are private corporations with vast endowments administered by boards of trustees. Out of a total of over nine hundred such institutions, seven hundred of them are private. As a consequence, they have been less subject to the devastating manipulation of partisan politics; but they have not escaped the withering domination of intolerant, bigoted, and prejudiced boards of control. For the most part these boards are made up of business men, lawyers, and ministers who lay great store by the existing order and conformity to current opinion. There are many instances of teachers "fired," not because of incompetence but because they taught doctrines and ideas unpleasant to those in control. But the boards are no less keen to check radical and unusual opinions among the student body. The record is filled with cases of students suspended and college publications suppressed because they circulated ideas which were thought to be "immoral and subversive." Recently two students and a graduate instructor were expelled from the University of Pittsburgh because they invited Professor Harry Elmer Barnes to address the Liberal Club and demanded the unconditional release of Tom Mooney and Warren Billings. Not only were the students dismissed but the club was dissolved. This was done notwithstanding the fact that at Pittsburgh, as elsewhere, university forums are systematically thrown open to conservative and reactionary speakers of all kinds. Anyone interested in learning more about the control of American Universities should consult Thorstein Veblen's *Higher Learning in America*, J. McK. Cattell's

University Control, and Upton Sinclair's interesting although often inaccurate *Goose-Step*.

If teachers and students who criticize existing social practices and institutions are to be "weeded out," are university authorities equally careful to guard the students from distorted ideas taught by reactionary professors, sometimes in the pay of special corporate interests? If the college is to be protected from radicalism, is it not equally necessary to protect it from Bourbonism? So far as the writer is aware, there is not a single case on record where a professor or student has been dismissed because he was too reactionary or subservient to those economic and social groups which dominate America. In an educational institution, it would seem at least equally pernicious to teach the student to cling tenaciously to accepted creeds as to teach him to clamor for the new. If, as President Hutchins of Chicago recently declared, education is not a "process of settling, or hardening, [or] of the fixation of sound principles and righteous dogma," but rather has for its purpose "to unsettle the minds of young men, to widen their horizon, and to influence their intellects," then so-called radical teaching should constitute an important part of every college curriculum. As Everett Dean Martin puts it, "Education may not end in doubt, but it ends when a man stops doubting."

We have seen how the public utilities have attempted to control teaching in the elementary and high schools. They have been no less solicitous about the colleges. They have conducted a nation-wide survey of college texts and courses in economics to eliminate as far as possible all teaching which conflicts with their own vested interests. They have established professorships and "research departments" and

have directly subsidized professors. Mr. George Lewis, director of the Rocky Mountain Committee on Public Utility Information, wrote not long ago: "We now have twenty-four public utility company executives as members of the University [of Colorado] faculty, and Mr. Wolfe is collaborating with each in the preparation of the nine major subjects covered." At one time or another the public utility interests have paid fees to professors of the University of Nebraska, of Ohio State, of Harvard, of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, of the University of Minnesota, and of the University of Iowa. In many cases these professors consented to the use of their names and the prestige of their institutions to "put over" the most questionable misinformation concerning the power industry. So far, none of these men has been dismissed.*

As in the case of the elementary and high schools, colleges are to be judged by the character of their teaching staffs and the intellectual fare offered to the student. If teachers cannot be trusted, if they are either bought or frightened into becoming special pleaders for particular groups, we might better shut up shop. As Alexander Meiklejohn wrote in the *New Republic* for October 25, 1922, "All that the teacher has to give is just his way of thinking about the world." If "his way of thinking" is distorted by his own economic or social connections, he ceases to be an educator and becomes a special pleader.

In spite of numerous cases of censorship and suppression, it is perhaps true to say that college professors enjoy a

* "It is unfortunate," says the report of the League of Iowa Municipalities for 1927, "that the people of this state cannot go to their employees in the engineering departments of the State University at Iowa City and the Iowa State College at Ames and secure fair and impartial infor-

greater measure of genuine freedom than any other considerable group in the United States. If our colleges display a spirit of "standpattism," the fault lies chiefly with the faculties themselves. "We professors," says Henry Raymond Mussey, "lack faith and courage and brains, and because we lack them our colleges are what they are instead of what we dream of their being. . . . I do not mean that we professors are worse than other people. We are not. . . . But we professors ought to be better, because we have a better chance. . . . If our faith, our courage, and our brains matched our opportunities, we could create the college of our dreams, and no one could say us nay."

American colleges have been overorganized and overadministered. The body of available information is so vast that specialization has become a necessity. This specialization has been carried to such lengths in our institutions of higher learning as to justify the remark that college professors are men who come to know "more and more about less and less." No one will deny that, if the frontiers of knowledge are to be advanced, specialization is necessary. But there is always the danger that students taught by specialists will fail utterly to grasp the significance of what is taught in its relation to the world in which they live. The left hind leg of a frog is a complicated mechanism which requires time and patience to understand, but it is equally important to remember that the leg is not the whole frog.

So far as public opinion is concerned, the most important

---

mation. It is a lamentable condition when a public official cannot trust the professional advice of the engineering departments in our state colleges . . . but so long as these men receive large fees from corporations for mediocre services, just so long must we look upon all their work, all their advice, and all their publications with suspicion."

branch of American college education is the undergraduate liberal arts department. But the specialization which necessarily characterizes advanced teaching and research has crept into this field with devastating effect. Our liberal arts colleges have been departmentalized almost to death. We have "departments" of economics, sociology, psychology, religion, government, and within each department countless minor subdivisions. The student takes courses in these various departments; and unless he is exceptional, he is likely never to learn that there is any but the remotest relation between them. To the average student they are mutually exclusive fields. The result is a lack of synthesis which makes his undergraduate education of dubious value in meeting and understanding the problems of contemporary life. Professor James Harvey Robinson used to say, "A college is a place where there is much teaching, maybe bad, and no learning."

In recent years commendable efforts are being made to organize instruction in such a way as to break down these artificial barriers. The course in Introduction to Contemporary Civilization required of all freshmen and sophomores at Columbia University endeavors to give the student an understanding of his social heritage and the factors which have entered into the making of western civilization. In his second year he is led to examine contemporary institutions and their problems in the light of this background. The various branches of knowledge, such as philosophy, history, psychology, and economics, are treated not in isolation but as parts of a single whole, each throwing light upon contemporary civilization. He is taught habits of inquiry and integration and comes to realize that life is not static, that

civilization is a flux, that the world does move, and that the so-called "immutable principles" of present-day society may become so much worthless lumber tomorrow.

This is the sort of education a liberal arts college should offer if we wish to educate leaders of men rather than sheep. The student will be educated, not because he is able to quote passages from Virgil and Horace in a dead tongue, or talk familiarly about Tycho Brahe or Belisarius, but because he has acquired insight, appreciation, and understanding. Unfortunately few colleges offer such training. It is expensive, requires a large and exceptionally able teaching staff, and plays havoc with departmental perquisites and "spheres of influence."

For thousands of students, college is a pleasant interlude of four years between adolescence and material acquisition. It is a place, as one student expressed it, "to meet nice people, form valuable social contacts, learn how to carry on an amiable conversation, and have a good time." With their club and fraternity life, colleges become training schools in snobbery. In fact, Professor Robert E. Rogers, of M. I. T., in a recent address to the seniors of that institution said: "Be a snob. You will find it is just as easy to marry the boss's daughter as the stenographer. Dress, speak, and act like a gentleman and you will be surprised at the amount of murder you can get away with. Shave yourself and never wear the same collar at night which you wear all day." If this be the ideal of college education, it might better be abandoned. But Professor Rogers was describing the ideals of a large section of our college population. Snobbery is cultivated; the sheep are carefully sifted from the goats on the basis of "family," wealth, athletic ability, and "smooth-

ness." The preoccupation with managerships, "social" affairs, and campus politics forces the intellectual life into the background, where it stands as a sort of grim god to which some slight obeisance must be paid as the price of continuing to live in this happy world. As one educator aptly phrased it, "the sideshows have swallowed up the circus."

It would be unfair to imply that our colleges are completely lacking in progressive thought. One has only to consult student publications to be convinced of an intellectual ferment that is vigorous and healthy. College newspapers have brought about the abolition of required chapel in Dubuque University and at Yale. They have taken the lead in the fight against compulsory military training, and they have time and again lampooned the snobbishness and stupidity of campus "society."

But these publications not infrequently feel the harsh hand of the censor. When the editor of the Boston University *Beanpot* laughed at the local R.O.T.C. she was removed. The Trinity College *Tripod* severely criticized the dean for declaring that the policy of the college was to "disregard the individual and turn out a Trinity type." The editor was suspended for a month and removed from the editorship of the paper. President W. W. Campbell, of the University of California, suppressed the *Occident* for publishing a "blasphemous" story of Joseph and Jesus. It is significant that this paper had roundly criticized compulsory drill, university censorship, and the "conversion of the university into an enlarged success school." When the *Occident* moved off the campus and published a survey on sex attitudes among the fraternities, the editor was expelled a month before his graduation. At the University of Illinois, the *Illinois Maga-*

zine was suppressed "after a group of captains of the zinc industry in La Salle had objected to a series of too realistic 'Zinc City Sketches.' "

On most campuses one will find International Relations and Social Problems clubs — vital centers of thought and discussion. Their membership is small, it is true, but they act as a leaven which cannot be overlooked. Student Forums bring to the campus speakers of widely divergent viewpoints, including such people as Admiral Plunkett, Norman Thomas, Sir Bernard Pares, Scott Nearing, John Cowper Powys, Vachel Lindsay, Lewis E. Lawes, and even the communist William Z. Foster.

In his very penetrating book *College or Kindergarten*? Dean Max McConn, of Lehigh University, lists what he regards as the chief motives impelling young people to go to college. There is, first, "The Bread and Butter Purpose." This, he suggests, is the purpose of an overwhelming majority. "In other words, the social purpose of the college of today, as conceived by the majority of the clientele, . . . is no longer to provide a ministry of any kind for the community, but rather to afford special privilege and a differential advantage in the economic struggle."

The purpose of higher education is thus conceived to be not essentially different from that of the trade school. It would be narrow and unfair to deny that such a motive is legitimate. But when vocational training becomes the central purpose, rather than an endeavor to give new significance and meaning to life by training students in habits of inquiry and constructive criticism, college education ceases to be the dynamic force in society which we have a right to expect it to be.

The second purpose, says Dean McConn, is "The Super-kindergarten Purpose." This motive is confined chiefly, although not wholly, to those who are economically secure and intellectually satisfied. "The boy does not have to learn a trade or profession; he will be taken, in due course, into Dad's business, or, if he does not care for that particular line, Dad will set him up in almost any other business he may eventually select. As for the girl, she will marry and marry well." The purpose of the college for these students is that of a super-kindergarten "to take care of a group of older babies, who have progressed, in their amusements, from rattles to rah-rahs." The college thus takes on the aspect of an amusement park, with fraternities, football, and house parties substituted for roller coasters and Ferris wheels.

The third purpose is "The Culture Purpose," for a small minority, who are genuinely interested in "the transmission of culture — of knowledge and beauty and understanding, and of a delight in these things and their uses in the world." From this group will come the leaders of future thought. "They come," says Henry Raymond Mussey, "from homes, sometimes of poverty and ignorance and narrowness, but likewise of sturdiness and ambition and hope, sometimes from homes of wealth and broad culture, homes in which riches have not softened the fine fiber of the spirit or corroded the metal of the mind."

Our colleges, then, reflect the dominant motives in American civilization. Whatever virtues or shortcomings they may have are not peculiar to them but are the virtues and shortcomings of civilization in the United States.

"By their fruits you shall know them." The fruits of higher education in America are the alumni. With few exceptions,

they are indifferent to the intellectual life of *alma mater.* They are concerned with football, crew, fraternity life. When on occasion they manifest an interest in the other activities of the college, it is usually to "stem the tide of irreligion and radicalism," to stamp out anything which smacks of the new or unusual. Speaking at the University Club of Chicago in March, 1908, Woodrow Wilson, then president of Princeton, said: "When we revolutionized the course of study at Princeton and absolutely changed the method of instruction, [it] raised hardly a ripple upon the surface of the alumni. . . .

"But when we came to touching the social life of the University, that was another matter; not a ripple of excitement, not a mere ripple of excitement, but a storm of excitement swept the body academic, and we knew that we had at last touched the vital matter." At another time he said: "The fact is, that for some time a considerable portion of the undergraduate body has looked upon Princeton University as simply an academic and artistic background for the club life that is now such a prominent feature of the place."

An amusing picture of American college life is given in a small pamphlet recently printed by Stephen P. Duggan, director of the Institute of International Education, entitled *Good-Bye, England.* Mr. Duggan says:

> Good-bye, Oxford and Cambridge, seats of traditional learning and teaching! Good-bye to venerable colleges, wonderful courts, and beautiful 'backs'; to comfortless quarters and attendant 'scouts'; to 'high table' where soup is preceded by an unintelligible prayer and meat is followed by adjournment with napkin to another room for dessert and wine and coffee and conversation. Good-bye to the rational curriculum which provides for concentration in studies and intercourse with teachers

and a final examination in the entire field of study. Good-bye to students who scorn to be passmen and to modest dons who fear to dogmatize in their own subjects and profess complete ignorance in all others. Good-bye to Isis and Cam, to cricket and delightful days in punts, to sport for the sake of sport and the fun one gets out of it.

I'm going home! Home to colleges with comfortable dormitories arranged into delightful suites, with lounging rooms for girl students who smoke; colleges with wonderful gymnasiums, hygienic showers, and inviting pools; true models of efficient administration and quantity production. Where sport is a spectacle and a combat applauded by a hundred thousand gathered in a stadium that dwarfs the Roman Colosseum, applauded — not spontaneously — for applause, like everything pertaining to 'sport,' is organized, and one claps and shouts at the signal of a cheer leader. I'm going home! Home where professors pontificate in all subjects and where the extracurricular activities form the main interest of student life; where degrees are obtained by accumulating 'credits' attached to subjects diffused over unrelated fields and elected by students who regard the passing mark as that of a gentleman, and who recover from 'conditions' by securing additional 'credits' at summer sessions — at $10 each.

We must not exaggerate the importance of collegiate education upon public opinion. On the whole, there is more liberalism, more honest searching for the truth, here than in the elementary and high schools. But compelled, as they are, to please the powers that control the purse, and to please the hordes of young people whose main interests are in play or profit, they not infrequently become academic mortuaries. They are limited also by the material with which they are forced to deal. College students, averaging in age between eighteen and twenty-two years, have already been subjected to the deadening lock-step discipline of the elementary and

high schools. The cards are stacked against the colleges; they are dealing with dead souls. As President Hutchins says, "It is sad but true that at eighteen or nineteen or graduation from high school it is too late to take a boy and make a man of him. . . . He has solidified too often in more ways than one." The products of American colleges can be seen in every Rotary, Kiwanis, and University Club in the land. They meet to discuss the latest stock quotations, air their pet political prejudices, or when *alma mater* is mentioned, express wonder "why in hell the football team made such a poor showing." As Professor Cattell remarked, "The average University Club in America could more easily dispense with its library than with its bar."

Chapter V

THE FOURTH ESTATE

The writer once asked twenty-five persons of good education and judgment to list in order of importance the various factors which influence public opinion. In every case the newspaper was placed at the top of the list. "The newspapers," says Norman Angell, "are practically the only means which the community has of informing itself of the facts which determine its collective decisions, social and political." The Press is the eyes and ears of society and not infrequently its pulpit and forum. W. T. Stead wrote in 1886: "I am but a comparatively young journalist, but I have seen cabinets upset, ministers driven into retirement, laws repealed, great social reforms initiated, . . . generals nominated, governors appointed, armies sent hither and thither, war proclaimed, and war averted by the agency of newspapers." Editors have been elevated to the peerage in England and the Presidency in America as a reward for their services in behalf of a political party. "During the Civil War," says Lucy Salmon, "it was the influence of the New York *Tribune* that was credited with having made possible the election of Lincoln." So powerful was the *Tribune* of Horace Greeley that thousands of persons suspended judgment on public questions until they were told what to think by the *Tribune*. "Wait until the *Weekly Tribune* comes," said Professor Earl Barnes's grandfather, "and then I can tell you what I think about it."

In a democracy, public opinion is king, and statesmen frequently use newspapers to test public reaction to a proposed policy. President Hoover gave as an argument against the proposed debenture plan for farm relief the fact that an overwhelming majority of the newspapers of the country had commented adversely upon it.

In 1898 Mr. F. Remington, Cuban correspondent of the New York *Journal*, cabled Mr. Hearst, its editor and owner, "Everything is quiet. There is no trouble here. There will be no war. I wish to return." Mr. Hearst replied as follows: "Please remain. You furnish the pictures, and I'll furnish the war." There are many who believe that in this instance he "delivered the goods."

"Nations are known to other nations mainly through their Press," said E. L. Godkin. It is reliably reported that Mustapha Kemal, the astute President of Turkey, having noted that his hanging of thirteen political offenders produced an unfavorable reaction in American newspapers, refrained from asking the death penalty for some fifty-seven others.

Newspapers are often an international irritant. It is impossible to estimate the damage done to our Mexican relations by the publication in 1928 by the Hearst papers of forged documents purporting to reveal that certain United States Senators were bribed by the Mexican government. "Every country," said Bismarck, "is held at some time to account for the windows broken by its Press; the bill is presented some day or other in the shape of hostile sentiment in the other country."

There is a widespread belief that the power of the Press is on the wane. In 1909 every newspaper in New York City except one vainly opposed the election of Mayor Gaynor.

In 1917 when Mayor Mitchell was running for reëlection, he had the united support of three-fourths of the New York newspapers, yet he was overwhelmingly defeated by the Tammany candidate. In the Hylan-Curran contest of 1924, newspaper support was distributed as follows: Of thirteen New York newspapers, nine, with daily circulation of 2,000,000 copies, were against Hylan; four, with a daily circulation of 1,000,000 copies, were for him. In spite of this opposition, Hylan was elected by a majority of 400,000.

In every social gathering one hears arguments dismissed and evidence discounted as "mere newspaper talk." None the less, newspapers continue to influence opinion through their interpretation of current events, through editorials, and through the character and amount of news which they print. "The constant iteration of any idea in a daily newspaper will presently capture public attention, whether the idea be good or bad, sensible or foolish." To measure its influence accurately is difficult. The basic attitudes of most men and women are pretty well formed before they begin to read newspapers. The family, the school, and the Church have done their work. Newspapers rarely make opinions — they play upon existing stereotypes. Few persons buy papers which are consistently at odds with their cherished beliefs. Few persons reared in Catholic homes and educated in parochial schools will regularly purchase an anti-Catholic paper. A southern Democrat will rarely read a Republican paper. A map of some 2,200 newspapers in the United States shows that practically no Republican dailies are published in the solid Democratic South. In solid Republican states the reverse is true. In Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Wisconsin, Minnesota, the Dakotas, Michigan, Ne-

braska, and Washington, Democratic dailies are very few and far between.

There was a time when a newspaper was identified with a powerful editor. People swore *by* and *at* Greeley, Bowles, Bryant, Raymond, and Godkin. "In the golden age of our craft," said one veteran editor, "every editor wore his conscience on his arm, and carried his dueling weapon in his hand, walked always in the light where the whole world could see him, and was prepared to defend his published opinions with his life if need be." It is a common failing of men to look longingly to the past and to assume that all were giants in the old days, whereas pygmies rule the roost today.

Without painting roseate pictures of the past, one is none the less compelled to admit that as an organ of opinion the newspaper has declined. Newspapers today are only incidentally interested in molding public opinion. Their primary concern is to make money for their owners. They represent tremendous investments. The day is gone when a Horace Greeley could establish a *Tribune* for $1,000, or a James Gordon Bennett a *Herald* for $500. The present New York *Herald-Tribune* is capitalized at over $200,000, the *World* at $500,000, and the *Times* at $10,000,000. The Kansas City *Star* recently sold for $11,000,000, and the Chicago *Daily News* for $13,000,000. The annual cost of operating a daily in a city of 150,000 population in 1928 was, according to *Editor and Publisher*, about $100,000. Syndicate features cost on the average $16,500 a year; wire service, $22,000; state news, $4,500; local staff, $16,000; executive salaries, $15,000; copy desk, $16,000; engraving, photography, travel, and incidentals, $10,000. Journalism has become not only a business but a "big business."

The bulk of newspaper income is derived from the sale of advertising. In 1927 the total revenue of American newspapers was $977,648,187, of which $724,837,083, or about three-fourths, came from advertising. More specifically, the New York *Times* in 1926 had a gross revenue of $25,000,000, of which approximately $22,000,000 was derived from advertising.

The business department of the modern newspaper has taken precedence over the editorial department. The free editor, courageously crusading for ideas and ideals, has largely passed. Today he is the hired servant of a huge corporation which seldom allows politics or principle to stand in the way of profits. "We are now," says William Allen White, "satellites of the business office." The business manager is in command.

Since the advertiser is the goose that lays the journalistic golden egg, it has been assumed by many that he dictates newspaper policy. Upton Sinclair quotes George French, editor of a Boston paper, as saying: "You cannot get anything into the newspapers that in any way rubs up against the business policy of the banks and department stores or of the public service corporations." André Siegfried, in his book *America Comes of Age*, repeats this accusation. He says: "The great newspapers, as everyone knows, live entirely by their advertising. Logically, therefore, they are bound to fall sooner or later under the influence of high finance and big business which pays for publicity. Whenever an editorial contradicts their views, the captains of industry can exert a little pressure. 'Your editorials are not up to our standards,' they write; and the editor, realizing what he is up against, gives in. Otherwise the paper goes to the wall."

The big advertiser, say these critics, not only enjoys immunity from newspaper criticism, but items of news hostile to his interests are suppressed. Charles A. Ross cites the case of a street-car strike in one city which at first "the newspapers were disposed to treat in a sympathetic way. Suddenly they veered, and became unanimously hostile to the strikers. Inquiry showed that the big merchants had threatened to withdraw their advertisements unless the newspapers changed their attitude." Since labor organizations do not advertise and employers do, the workers are likely to fare badly in the news columns during an industrial dispute.

Owners and editors have vigorously denied these charges. "I happen to know," says Ralph Pulitzer, of the New York *World*, "that the *World* in its career has deliberately thrown away millions of dollars of advertising by attacking for the public good various interests which thereafter *very naturally refused* to advertise in a hostile paper. [Italics mine.] . . . I am sincerely convinced that with the exception of a few blackguardly sheets . . . the Press of the country does not prostitute itself by shifting its editorial policy at the orders of its advertisers." But even here Pulitzer admits that pressure from advertisers is great, since an independent policy has cost the *World* so dearly. Certainly the public utility interests are convinced that advertising keeps newspapers friendly. "Unquestionably," says J. B. Sheridan, of the Missouri Committee on Public Utility Information, "when you talk advertising to most newspaper men they warm to you. . . . If we could stimulate a little local advertising for some of the local newspapers, I think we will have the newspapers and the operators so closely associated that it will be impossible to split them." Sheridan insisted that the utilities

would have to "grease the rails" with advertising if they hoped to get newspaper support.

Labor leaders and liberals who criticize the Press because of its capitalistic sympathies too often forget that newspaper owners are themselves capitalists. Inevitably they take the point of view of the social and economic class to which they belong. They have labor troubles of their own and are likely to sympathize with other employers involved in strikes. Furthermore, as newspaper profits pile up, the owner invests in other enterprises. He becomes a director or influential stockholder in railroads, public utilities, and steel mills. It is to be expected that in the conduct of his paper he will "tread lightly" where these interests are concerned. There is the classic illustration of the newspaper magnate who supplied all of his editors and subeditors with a list of the corporations in which he was interested. Any news or comment hostile to these "sacred cows" was strictly tabu. As Bruce Bliven once wrote, "I believe it is a fair statement that 90 per cent of the editors of the country's conservative papers sincerely endorse the doctrines they set forth." Big business men do not have to bribe or bully newspaper owners; it is unnecessary, for they are brothers.

More important in controlling newspaper policy is the pressure for large circulation. Generally speaking, the advertising rate varies directly with the circulation of the paper. In 1929, advertising rates in American newspapers averaged $3.40 per line per million of circulation for the evening papers and $2.52 per line per million circulation for the morning papers. A full page in color in Hearst's *American Weekly*, a feature of his Sunday editions, which goes into some 4,000,000 homes, costs the advertiser about

$16,000 per issue. In general the papers with the largest circulation are the most profitable. Since the advertiser is interested in selling goods, he is not much concerned, as a usual thing, with the ideas the paper represents or the doctrines which it preaches, if it reaches the public that buys his product.

In order to build up circulation the newspaper must please the widest possible public. "[The] Press is bound to respect the point of view of the buying public," says Walter Lippmann. "The newspaper can flout an advertiser, it can attack a powerful banking or traction interest, but if it alienates the buying public it loses the one indispensable asset to its existence." The advertiser pays the piper but the reader calls the tune. This is of more importance in controlling newspaper policy than the pressure of advertisers or the economic interests of newspaper owners. "It is my feeling that the only pressure to which editors as a whole yield," says William Allen White, "is the pressure of the *mores* of the time, the pressure of the generally accepted stereotyped conceptions in all fields of thought." "Step on no toes" becomes the motto of the profit-seeking press.

A newspaper which takes a decided stand on controversial issues runs the risk of displeasing a large section of the buying public. The tendency has been for the Press to develop a "broadmindedness" on these issues which virtually amounts to "blankmindedness." Newspapers gyrate back and forth, straddle the fence, and try to be all things to all people. The reader is thus able to find in the paper, at one time or another, ideas which exactly fit his existing stereotypes. Arthur Brisbane begins his column with a declaration that war is futile and militarism stupid, and ends with a demand

that the United States have a navy and air force second to none. The Hearst papers alternate between pacifism and militarism, are violently anti-Britsh one day and enthusiastic advocates of Anglo-American friendship the next. In one issue they call for the forcible annexation and civilization of Mexico, and in another for the immediate recognition of "our sister republic to the South." Newspapers must play in with local prejudices. It would be almost fatal on the Pacific coast for an editor to espouse the cause of the "Japs." The Hearst papers in the South speak the language of the Klan, and in New York that of the Catholics and Jews. When a temporary wave of excitement or indignation sweeps the country, these papers feed it and thus increase their circulation. During the months prior to our entry into the war, Hearst put American flags on the front pages of his papers. On March 3, 1917, he wired S. S. Carvalho, of the New York *American*, as follows:

"If the situation quiets down, please remove color flags from first page and little flags from inside pages, reserving these for special occasions of a warlike or patriotic kind. I think they have been good for this week, giving us a very American character and probably helping sell papers, but to continue effective they must be reserved for occasions." When public feeling was running high against Bolshevism following the war, the New York *Times* had Petrograd fall six times, burned twice, and in revolt against the Bolsheviks six times.

Newspapers are compelled to speak the language of the crowd. Every effort is made to appeal to those emotions and experiences which all people share. Upon their mastheads they might well write the words, *Lust, Avarice*, and

Fear, for these are the emotions to which they appeal. These principles were clearly set forth in a memorandum prepared for the reporters of Hearst's *Washington Times*. It said in part [Italics mine]:

We must consider that the Composite newspaper reader does not care a hang about tax-rates, budgets, insurance, disarmament, naval appropriations, public utility policies, municipal improvements, or scores of other subjects which may appear to be important.

Newspaper readers are most interested in stories which contain the elements most dominant in the primitive emotions of themselves, namely,

1. Self-preservation [*Fear*]
2. Love, or Reproduction [*Lust*]
3. Ambition [*Avarice*]

Stories containing one of these elements are good, those which contain two of the elements are better; those which contain all three elements form first-class newspaper material.

Self-preservation — Under this heading come stories of murder, suicide, rescues, accidents, fights, etc.

Love, or Reproduction — This element is contained in stories of marriage scandal, divorce, human triangles, romances, unusual acts done with love motive, jealousy, sex attraction, etc.

Ambition — [Here success stories] and articles tending to stimulate the reader to emulate the activity of a character in a story. . . .

Let us write our stories for the Composite reader. . . . Let us disregard, or cover perfunctorily, subjects which are merely important, but not interesting.

The memorandum cited the Hall-Mills murder case as a perfect newspaper story.

The newspaper, says Sir Philip Gibbs, regards life "as a variety show. [News is] admitted not because of its importance to the nation or the world, but because it makes a

good 'story' for the breakfast table." This theory has worked an amazing transformation in the content of newspapers. O. K. Armstrong compared the space allotted to various items in the St. Louis *Republican* of 1875 and the St. Louis *Post Dispatch* of 1925, with the following results, in percentages:

	1875	*1900*	*1925*
News	55.3	55.3	26.7
Opinion	9.6	7.1	2.2
Features	6.3	5.5	10.4
Advertising	28.9	32.1	60.5

The character of the news is illustrated in the following percentages:

	1875	*1900*	*1925*
Sports	1.7	5.1	25.4
Business	26.9	8.2	20.
Crime	4.9	3.1	10.7

"Fifty years ago," says Silas Bent, "crime occupied but 32 inches in the St. Louis *Republican*, today it holds an average of 161.3 inches in the *Post Dispatch*; double the ratio and quintuple the space." In answer to the criticism that the newspapers give a disproportionate amount of space to crime news, the New York *World* published the results of a survey made by the Wharton School of Finance and Commerce of the University of Pennsylvania. The front pages of eight leading eastern papers were studied and the news was tabulated for the period 1911 to 1915 and from October to February 1925. The results were, in percentages:

Political news	38.5	Business news	5
Foreign news	12.5	Art and science	3
Accident news	14.5	Society, religion, sports,	
Crime news	22.5	and obituaries	1 each

It is significant that crime and accident news together occupied 37 per cent of front-page space in the most "respectable" eastern papers. During twenty-four days of the Hall-Mills murder trial, 12,000,000 words were sent to newspapers — enough to fill 960 newspaper pages or, if put into book form, enough to make a shelf of novels twenty-two feet long.

If one analyzes the content of the "tabloids," whose circulation far outdistances that of the standard-sized sheets, the results are even more illuminating. The following table shows the percentage of total space, exclusive of advertising, devoted to various items, during a twelve-day period from October 11 to October 23, 1926:

	Graphic	*Daily Mirror*	*Daily News*
Crime, divorce, and annulment	13	13	12
Local and foreign news and editorials	11	12	17
Features — marriage problems, puzzles, etc.	75	74	68

It is evident that these papers are not journals of opinion but organs of entertainment. A large proportion of their space is given over to sensational pictures, mostly of the "sex-appeal" variety. One of the pictorial "scoops" of the *Daily News* was the publication on January 14, 1928, of an actual photograph of Ruth Snyder in the electric chair at Sing Sing just as the current was applied. This picture occupied the entire front page and aroused a storm of criticism. In answer to its critics the *News* said editorially on January 25, 1928:

Some ten days ago the *News* published what became the most widely discussed picture ever printed to date in a newspaper.

We refer to the photograph of Mrs. Ruth Brown Snyder in the electric chair at Sing Sing, taken as the lethal current was passing through the murderess' body. . . . The photograph's appearance seems to have offended the feelings of certain other newspapers. To these we would address a few remarks. . . . the incident throws light on the vividness of reporting when done by camera instead of by pencil and typewriter. Admittedly the picture stunned the sensibilities for the moment. It carried an almost electric shock to the brain of the beholder. But what was its net effect? We think that picture took the romance out of murder. Into every retina which received it, the picture hurled the stark figure of Reparation. . . . Why other newspapers which gave column after column of infinitely more gruesome descriptive language to the Snyder execution should criticize the *News* for publishing a photograph thereof is something we cannot understand.

Justification of crime news and pictures on the ground that they act as a deterrent is a familiar one. This claim can be matched by the fact that sixty inmates of Elmira reformatory attributed their downfall to the "alluring and romantic pictures of criminal life presented by the Press."

Whatever high moral purposes these newspapers may avow, the fact is that their constant exploitation of nudity, vice, and crime has no other purpose than the sale of papers, the building of circulation, and the consequent increase in advertising revenue. "They serve no other purpose," says O. G. Villard, "than to lure the pennies from the pockets of immaturity and pruriency. . . . Stripped of all humbug and hypocrisy, these papers are synonymous with bad taste, vulgarity, a degenerate sensationalism, a devotion to the drab and seamy side of life, which cannot be successfully championed on the ground that they are modern and therefore good and inspiring; but simply on the ground that they sell."

But one must not be too hard on the tabloids. The New York *Times*, in announcing the victory of Gene Tunney over Dempsey, used headlines of approximately the same size as it used in announcing the signing of the Armistice in November, 1918. In the *Nation* of December 8, 1926, Silas Bent published a comparison of space devoted to the Hall-Mills murder trial in three New York dailies over a period of twenty days:

Times _____	528,300 words	435 column inches of pictures
Daily News __	223,400 words	2,962 column inches of pictures
American ____	347,700 words	2,691 column inches of pictures

Who reads the tabloids? According to the *New Republic*, "They have persuaded fully 1,330,000 persons [in New York] to buy newspapers who never bought them before." Although the tabloids have acquired a circulation of more than 2,000,000 a day, the other papers have lost during the same period only about 175,000 readers. None the less the older journals regard the newcomers as a menace, and many are seeking to offset the tabloid invasion by giving their own readers the sex and sentiment which to countless thousands is meat and drink.

A recent study by the American Association of Advertising Agencies of the circulation of New York newspapers throws considerable light on this question. From this study it appears that women read the sensational papers in greater numbers than do the men. Is this because these papers emphasize love and divorce? It is also significant that those in the lower economic classes read the sensational journals in greater numbers than do those in the higher income groups. Thus, over 50 per cent of the readers of the *Mirror* and the *Graphic*, 48 per cent of the *Daily News* readers, and

40 per cent of the *American* readers have incomes of $2,000 or less. The overwhelming bulk of the readers of the *Times*, the *Herald Tribune*, and the *World* have incomes of $2,000 or more. It seems clear that the "yellow" journals are read primarily by poorly paid workers. But many people read more than one paper. The amount of duplication in these cases depends upon the similarity of the papers. The figures for those who read more than one paper are significant: thus 40 per cent of the readers of Hearst's *American* also read the *Journal*, another Hearst publication, while 75 per cent of the *Journal* readers buy the Sunday *American*; 62 per cent of the readers of the *Graphic* also read the *Daily News*; 57 per cent of the readers of the *Post* read the *Herald Tribune*; and 30 per cent of the *Herald Tribune* readers consult the *Times*. On the other hand, where there is great dissimilarity there is but little duplication: for example, only 3 per cent of the readers of the *Mirror* and 5 per cent of the *Graphic* readers buy the *Times*.

It seems clear that newspaper readers do not buy two papers to get "both sides" but to get more of the same "stuff."

As journalism has advanced into the class of big business, newspapers "have followed the trend of the times toward mass production, consolidation, coöperative marketing, lower costs, high profits, mechanical progress, and mental stupefication." The process of consolidation and centralized control has gone on apace. In 1914 there were 2,500 daily newspapers in the United States; today there are less than 2,000. When Chicago was half its present size, it had seven morning papers; now it has two. When Detroit had a population of 200,000, it had three morning papers; today, with

a population of 1,000,000, it has but one. Nine cities with populations of 100,000 or more have no morning newspapers, and thirty-nine have only one. As the number of papers has declined, the total circulation has mounted. In 1914 the aggregate circulation per issue of daily and Sunday papers was 28,000,000; in 1929 it is more than 37,000,000.

Thirty-five per cent of the total circulation of American newspapers is controlled by fifty-five groups. From 1924 to 1927 the number of chains increased 80 per cent. This tendency has not ceased. An article in *Editor and Publisher* for June 15, 1929, says: "Eugene Greenhut, Inc., organizer last year of the Hahn Department Stores, Inc., is seeking to buy forty or more newspapers in the South and West and merge them together in a vast chain system." According to Mr. Greenhut, "there is absolutely no connection between the Hahn stores and the enterprise." Furthermore, he says, "we certainly have no desire to control the policies of the papers." The purpose of the enterprise is a purely business one. These chain newspapers are organized to sell news, entertainment, and advertising, very much as chain grocery stores are organized to sell soup and beans. Is it any wonder that William Allen White, in commenting upon the death of Frank Munsey, one of the leaders in this movement, said:

"Frank Munsey, the great publisher, is dead.

"Frank Munsey contributed to the journalism of his day the talent of a meat packer, the morals of a money changer and the manners of an undertaker. He and his kind have about succeeded in transforming a once noble profession into an 8 per cent security.

"May he rest in peace."

The purpose of these consolidations is economic efficiency

and high profits. This is achieved through standardization, large-scale production, and the elimination of every feature or idea which does not pay. Every day and Sunday in the United States millions of people are fed exactly the same brand of news and nonsense, until they are rapidly developing a "chain store mind." As Silas Bent writes, "routine local news in large cities is gathered and distributed . . . by coöperative bureaus; comic strips, cartoons, photographs, fillers, uplift essays for the editorial page, household hints, 'columns,' book reviews, Sunday magazine sections, are all turned out by the cubic yard in New York and published simultaneously in Oshkosh and Omaha, Kankakee and Keokuk, Minneapolis and Miami. Cut off their title lines, and the most loyal native son cannot tell the Bingville Bugle from the Gallopolus Gazette." The Hearst papers go into some four million American homes from coast to coast every day, carrying, except for a few minor local items, identical material from the scare heads on the front page to the editorial on the back. It is said that five million people read Arthur Brisbane's column, "Today." According to Col. Frank Knox, general manager for Hearst, a thousand newspapers use "news or features gathered . . . by the Hearst organization." Goose-step, lock-step, is the rule in our newspapers as in our schools.

There are in the neighborhood of a hundred news and feature syndicates in the United States. Most of what they send out is drivel. Countless serial stories are syndicated, 95 per cent of which deal with love and sex obsessed with sniveling sentimentality. Here is one telling of how a sweet, innocent country girl goes to the city and is seduced by her handsome boss; another about the girl who is too free with

her affection, is betrayed, and finally marries her childhood sweetheart in the old home town; another of a flapper wife who singes her wings in the flames of illicit love only to find that true happiness lies with her husband and children. "Chickie," "The Flapper Wife," "The Petter," are typical titles. Famous murders are revived, there are success stories of how men have become rich by cobbling their own boots, and tales of Bluebeards and brothels. There are comics galore, which, "with only a few exceptions," according to Dewey Owens, "seem designed wholly for half-wits and children unable to read." For these the "artists" are paid fabulous salaries. Bud Fisher draws $225,000 a year for the antics of Mutt and Jeff. Andy Gump, which appears in 450 papers, is reputed to have made his creator, Sidney Smith, a millionaire. Recently, these syndicates have taken to sending out "simplified" and illustrated serial editions of popular books. Dreiser's *American Tragedy* and Durant's *Story of Philosophy* have been tabloidized and syndicated "in pictorial form and primer language for persons who are unable to comprehend words of more than two syllables." There are features giving "Advice to the Lovelorn" by Beatrice Fairfax and Dorothy Dix, spiritual advice by the Reverend S. Parkes Cadman, medical advice by the Hon. Dr. Royal S. Copeland, "culture" by Dr. Frank Crane, and poetry by Edgar Guest. The prince of them all is Arthur Brisbane, who, according to Mr. Owens, preaches that "(1) Japan will one day invade the land of the brave, carry off our women, and murder our men; (2) we ought to build airplanes and be ready; (3) any public bull of the Hon. William Randolph Hearst is irreproachable and should be respectfully received; (4) California has the greatest climate in the world; (5) it

is great to be a mother; (6) God is just and won't send imperfect men to a blazing hell."

An important change in modern journalism is the increasing use of "prepared" news. Large corporations, important personages, politicians, and even churches maintain professional publicity agents who supply the Press with formal and carefully prepared statements of any "news" affecting their interests. It has been estimated that there are five thousand such agents in New York City and about two thousand in Washington. Many reporters today are little more than intellectual mendicants who go from one publicity agent or press bureau to another seeking "handouts." It is not unusual for half of the news in a paper to be obtained in this way. Out of 64 items in one paper, 42 were rewritten or pasted up from press agent "handouts." In the New York *Times* of December 29, 1926, out of a total of 255 stories, 147 were apparently from these sources. How much of this material is legitimate news and how much is propaganda? H. C. Klemfuss, of Campbell's undertaking parlor in New York, boasted that he got a million lines of free advertising in the news columns as a result of Rudolph Valentino's funeral.

Newspaper reporting at its best is subject to serious limitations. A reporter invariably views a situation through glasses colored by his own predilections and prejudices. No two will describe the same event in exactly the same way. When Alexander Kerensky was assaulted in a New York theater, the affair was described as follows in various New York newspapers:

World: [She] slashed him viciously across the cheek with her gloves.

News: Struck him on the left cheek with her bouquet.

American: Dropped her flowers and slapped him in the face with her gloves.

Times: Slapped his face vigorously with her gloves three times.

Herald-Tribune: Beat him on the face and head . . . a half dozen blows.

Mirror: Struck him across the face several times.

In describing how Kerensky reacted, these papers said:

World: He stood still, but used his arms to wave back his friends.

News: He stepped back, maintaining a calm pose.

American: Kerensky reeled back.

Herald Tribune: He stood still with his arms thrown back.

Mirror: He reeled from the blow. His supporters were stemmed by a handful of royalists. Fists flew, noses ran red; shirts and collars were torn.

If reporters disagree on such a simple set of facts, is it surprising that they rarely agree on an affair as complicated as a strike? One will picture conditions in the coal districts of West Virginia as "barbaric," the miners' homes as "hovels," and the mine owners as "feudal barons." Another will speak of the "liberal labor policy" of the owners and the "comfortable homes" of the miners and will assert blandly that "whatever unrest there is, is due to walking delegates and communist agitators." Contrast the accounts of the Russian antichurch campaign of 1930 in the New York *Telegram* and the Chicago *Tribune*. It may be set down as an axiom that when reporters agree, a press agent is probably just around the corner. One who hopes to get the truth by reading several papers is doomed to disappointment; truth cannot be distilled from misstatements and distortions.

But news is colored in other ways than by the reporter's inability to describe accurately what he sees. Editors fre-

quently rewrite and often censor reports in such a way as to confirm what they believe to be the stereotypes of their readers. In the fall of 1924 Senator Burton K. Wheeler, speaking on behalf of La Follette, roundly denounced both the Democratic party and the Republican. The Associated Press reported the entire speech. The writer happened to be in Salem, Oregon, at the time, where both papers had Associated Press service. The Republican paper published all of Wheeler's denunciations of the Democrats but scarcely a word of criticism of the G.O.P. The Democratic daily contained all the accusations against the Republicans but only a few of the milder criticisms of the Democrats.

The public utility interests in their campaign against government ownership and effective regulation have not overlooked the newspapers. The New York Committee on Public Utility Information sends a weekly bulletin to every newspaper in the state giving the "facts" about the utilities and the "failures" of municipal ownership. The Ohio Committee distributes material to 700 newspapers. Over 4,000 bulletins are sent out in every mail. In 1926 this committee secured 20,000 column inches of news space, and 150 editorials were written by utility press agents. In Illinois 900 papers receive power bulletins, and B. J. Mullaney, of that state, boasted that 5,000 news columns of this material were printed every month. The New England Committee reported a total reprint of 8,000 column inches a year. John Mellet, of the Indiana Committee, succeeded in getting 30,000 to 35,000 column inches of "utility news" in the newspapers of that state in one year. Mr. Samuel Boney, of the South Carolina Bureau, said that out of 300 newspapers in the Carolinas only one was unfriendly to the utilities.

In addition to material sent out directly, the power inter-

ests have used other news agencies. H. Lee Jones, of the Kansas Bureau, wrote on April 6, 1926:

When we have had occasion to use the Associated Press, our material has gone over with a batting average of one thousand. We use the A. P. a great deal at convention time and have the material prepared well in advance so that part of it may be used as mail release stuff, while the bigger breaks are put on the wire. We have had only the finest coöperation from the Associated Press in Topeka, and its representatives have indicated their willingness to handle any material in which we feel they may be interested.

The E. C. Hofer and Sons agency of Portland, Oregon, has been subsidized to the extent of $84,000 a year by the utilities. This agency with some 14,000 newspaper clients specialized in "canned" editorials. Mr. Hofer testified that in four years they had secured 65,526 *pages* of newspaper reading for the utilities.

The power corporations have also gone into the newspaper business themselves. The International Paper and Power Company recently invested $10,788,700 in thirteen papers. Mr. Archibald Graustein, president of the company, says that "The International has no right, ability, or desire in any way to influence the news or editorial policy of any paper." The chief purpose of the investment, he says, is to insure a market for newsprint paper. Whatever its avowed purpose, it should make one suspicious of these journals. As *Editor and Publisher* remarks: "The scheme looks like . . . highly dangerous sales promotion, in that it lays the newspaper open to loss of vital public confidence." Unfortunately, most of the readers of these papers will probably never learn of the investment.*

* The International Paper and Power Company has recently divested itself of ownership in most of these papers.

The headlines are among the most important features of a newspaper. They are utilized to capture attention and promote sales, and in so doing they frequently distort the news. A number of years ago in Seattle, Washington, a certain Mrs. Mahoney was brutally beaten to death by her husband, and her body was placed in a trunk and sunk in Lake Union. During the trial of Mahoney the Seattle *Star* appeared on the streets one day with screaming headlines:

MRS. MAHONEY ALIVE!

Below this in tiny type it said: "when put in trunk." This can be matched, of course, with the headline in a New York paper during the illness of Rudolph Valentino, which said:

VALENTINO DEAD!

and below it: "is report."

Since countless readers get no further than the headlines, it is possible to "put over" false inferences and impressions. On February 18, 1898, after the sinking of the *Maine* in Havana harbor, the New York *Journal* shouted:

WHOLE COUNTRY THRILLS WITH THE WAR FEVER!

As a matter of fact there was no war fever except as it was promoted by these same papers. On April 17, 1898, the New York *World* announced:

DECLARATION OF WAR!

There was no declaration of war until almost two weeks later, but such headlines helped to bring it about. It was believed that the *Maine* had been destroyed by mines placed in the harbor by Spanish authorities. Subsequent investigation failed to produce any evidence to support this belief.

Shortly after the investigation the Detroit *Free Press* screamed:

MINES IN HARBOR!

and below, in small, inconspicuous type: "agents of the U. S. have been unable to find the slightest trace of their existence."

Newspapers assert in the headlines the most baseless falsehoods concerning public men, and when called to account make the correction in an inconspicuous item on an inside page. On October 16, 1924, a Philadelphia paper placed on its first page the following:

MOSCOW FUNDS AID LA FOLLETTE! SHIP MAN HINTS!

T. V. O'Conner asks who can deny Soviet sent money!

When a few days later these charges were proved to be false, a retraction was published in a very short paragraph on an inside page.

By playing on the emotions of crowds, newspapers are often able to perform notable public services. To them must go a great deal of credit for arousing the public conscience in times of great emergency such as the Mississippi floods and the Florida hurricanes. But their influence is not always so commendable. The Jackson (Mississippi) *Daily News* on June 26, 1919, devoted its front page to the following:

JOHN HARTFIELD WILL BE LYNCHED BY ELLISVILLE MOB AT 5 O'CLOCK THIS AFTERNOON

Thousands of People Are Flocking Into Ellisville to Attend the Event — Sheriff and Authorities Are Powerless to Prevent It.

In the news column it continued: ". . . the officers have agreed to turn him over to the people of the city at 4 o'clock

this afternoon, when it is expected he will be burned." If this is not incitement to riot and bloodshed, then nothing is. The disgusting display of mob behavior at the funeral of Rudolph Valentino was manufactured almost entirely by the newspapers.*

Where shall the seeker after truth turn for his news? Numerous writers have advocated the establishment of an endowed Press free from the pressure of advertisers, the business office, and the mob. But in the absence of some such source one is compelled to "make the best of it." The fact is that very few people want the truth. "The radical wants statements which support a radical point of view," says Bruce Bliven; "the liberal wants liberalism; and the conservative, reaction. It is a universal human failing to close our minds against information which does not fit our preconceptions. . . . The problem goes far deeper than furnishing good newspapers. It demands good readers, which is the concern, not of efficient journalism, but efficient democracy."

* What has been said in this chapter does not of course apply with equal force to all newspapers. Such journals as the New York *Times*, the Baltimore *Sun*, the Kansas City *Star*, the Portland *Oregonian*, and the *Christian Science Monitor* are generally reliable and have in varying degrees successfully resisted the tendency towards sentiment and sensation which characterizes their more widely read contemporaries.

Chapter VI

POLITICAL PARTIES AND THE POPULAR WILL

Political parties are everywhere recognized as instruments for the expression of opinion. In a democracy, based upon the consent of the governed, they are especially necessary since, theoretically at least, they voice the popular will. Since individuals differ in their social as well as in their biological heritage, it is to be expected that they will differ politically. According to Lord Macaulay all people divide naturally into conservatives and radicals — those who cling to accepted standards and those who seek to change them. The one thing which they have in common is that they "always act from self-interest." Another theory is that all Americans are instinctively either Hamiltonians (aristocrats) or Jeffersonians (democrats). As W. S. Gilbert once put it:

> I often think it's comical
> How Nature always does contrive
> That every boy and every gal
> That's born into the world alive,
> Is either a little Liberal
> Or else a little Conservative.

One might paraphrase it in America to read:

> I often think it's funny that
> In God's eternal plan
> Every single little brat

That's born into this happy lan'
Is either a little Democrat
Or else a little Republican.

According to James Madison the chief cause of parties is the unequal distribution of property. "Those who hold and those who are without property," he said, "have ever formed distinct interests in society." If one looks at Europe, these simple classifications break down. There we find not two parties but a dozen or more, ranging from the Communists through Democratic Liberals and Clericals to the Monarchists. Even in England there are three major parties: the Conservatives, who believe in individualism for everybody; the Liberals, who preach individualism for the capitalist and socialism for the worker; and the Laborites, who proclaim socialism for everybody.

In the United States, however, the distinction seems to hold true, for we have two major parties, Republican and Democratic. The difference between these parties, if we are to believe Claude Bowers, follows the familiar lines laid down above. Speaking at the Democratic convention in 1928, he said that the fundamental difference between them is their theory of government. The Republicans, following the principles of Alexander Hamilton, believe in the rule of the "rich and the well-born"; the Democrats, pursuing the political theories of Jefferson, believe that "no government is fit to live that does not conserve the interest of the average man." Contemporary political writers, however, insist that the historic differences between the parties have faded and that today they are as colorless as rain water. "The party term Republican," said Samuel G. Blythe in the *Saturday Evening Post* of March 25, 1922, "isn't definitive any more.

It isn't even descriptive. No more is the party term Democrat. They are labels on empty bottles, signs on untenanted houses, cloaks that cover but do not conceal the skeletons beneath them. . . . there are no genuine issues between them, no authentic differences of policy or performance. There is nothing between them save the desire of the Republicans, who are in power, to stay in power, and the desire of the Democrats, who are out of power, to get back in power." The only reason Mr. Blythe can see for being either a Republican or a Democrat is that one's father was one or the other, and "that isn't much of a reason, but it is the best there is."

In 1888 James Bryce, in *The American Commonwealth*, made the same criticism. "Neither party," he said, "has as a party any clear-cut principles. . . . Both have traditions. Both claim to have tendencies. Both have certain war cries, organizations, interests enlisted in their support. But these interests are, in the main, the interests of getting or keeping the patronage of the government." George Stirling Taylor once said that political conflicts arise not because people disagree, but because they agree — they all want the same things; and the Republican and Democratic alignment seems to bear him out. The lust for power and the desire to advance economic interests are still the basic factors in political behavior. "Politics has become the trade of managing the State in the interests of the men in possession, and their friends."

In spite of much talk about "states' rights," there is no substantial difference between the parties on that question. Compare the platforms of 1928. Say the Republicans: "[The Federal Government] should be equally zealous to respect

and maintain the rights of the States and Territories and to uphold the vigor and balance of our dual system of government. . . ." The Democratic platform declared: "We demand that the constitutional rights and powers of the States shall be preserved in their full vigor and virtue."

On the matter of the protective tariff there is likewise no fundamental difference. Both promised revision in 1928 but were equally vague as to what sort of revision. Their attitude on this issue reminds one of what "Mr. Dooley" said in 1909 on a "Tariff for Politics Only":

"I loathe th' tariff," says the Sinitor fr'm Virginya. "Fr'm me arliest days I was brought up to look on it with pizenous hathred. At miny a convintion ye cud hear me whoopin' agin' it. But if there is such a lot iv this monsthrous iniquity passin' around, don't Virginya get none! Gintlemen, I do not ask, I demand rights f'r me commonwealth. I will talk here ontil July fourth, nineteen hundred and eighty-two, agin' th' proposed hellish tax on feather beds onless somethin' is done f'r the tamarack bark iv old Virginya."

A Sinitor: "What's it used f'r?"

The Sinitor fr'm Virginya: "I do not quite know. It is ayether a cure f'r the hives or enthers largely into th' mannyfacture iv carpet slippers. But there's a friend iv mine who makes it an' he needs the money."

"Th' argyments iv the Sinitor fr'm Virginya are onanswerable," says Sinitor Aldhrich. "Wud it be agreeable to me Dimmycratic colleague to put both feather beds an' his what-ye-call-it in th' same item?"

"In such circumstances," says the Sinitor fr'm Virginya, "I would be foorced to waive me almost insane prejudice agin' th' hellish docthrines iv the distinguished Sinitor fr'm Rhode Island," says he.

Both parties claim to be the champions of the rights of labor and the freedom of the individual. Both insist that

they are the friends of business and material prosperity. Democrats and Republicans alike are staunch supporters of law enforcement and are implacable enemies of political corruption. Both agree on Prohibition. The Republican platform of 1928 said: "The people, through the method provided by the Constitution, have written the eighteenth amendment into the Constitution. The Republican Party pledges itself and its nominees to the observance and vigorous enforcement of this provision of the Constitution." The Democratic platform was equally definite: "Speaking for the National Democracy this convention pledges the party and its nominees to an honest effort to enforce the eighteenth amendment and all other provisions of the Federal Constitution and all laws enacted pursuant thereto." Both believe in education, transportation, a merchant marine, aviation, and national defense. A careful reading of their respective platforms reveals a surprising identity of interest.

It cannot be said that one party represents "big business" and the other the worker and small business man. It is not unusual for the same millionaire to contribute to both parties. In 1926 Mr. Samuel Insull, public utility magnate of Illinois, contributed to the campaign of both Frank Smith, the Republican candidate for United States Senator, and "Bill" Brennan, Democratic boss and candidate for the same office. As Mr. Havemeyer, of the sugar trust, testified at an earlier time, "In Republican states we contribute to the Republicans, and in Democratic states to the Democrats. [And in doubtful states] we contribute to both sides."

If, as A. Lawrence Lowell says, "The true function of political parties is that of formulating and presenting the alternatives between which people are to choose," then the

major parties in America are not fulfilling their proper function. The only alternative which they present is the choice between two different sets of politicians and office-seekers. One should not, however, minimize the importance of this. In America, with our fetish for electing every public official from dog-catcher to President, it is impossible for the voter to decide intelligently upon the qualifications of all candidates who present themselves. "Within the space of a year," says Professor Sait, "the Chicago voter is expected to register twice and go to the polls five times; he has to pass judgment on the candidates for some fifty different offices. In some counties in Illinois no less than seventy offices are filled at one election." In his bewilderment, the voter turns to the regular party organization for advice. He usually ends by voting a "straight ticket" and trusting to God.

So far as "issues" are concerned, American party battles are more like cockfights than campaigns. Does this account for the growing indifference toward them? In forty years the proportion of the actual to the eligible vote has declined from 80 to 50 per cent in Presidential elections. There is not much "kick" in a sham battle.

If the older parties are empty bottles, why not scrap them both? Why do people persist in calling themselves Republicans and Democrats — names which have lost all real significance? In the first place, there is the influence of tradition. These parties form part of the American's social heritage, and he is loath to break with familiar signs and symbols. We have cited the fact that from 65 to 85 per cent of party allegiance is due to family influences. The child of a Republican votes the Republican ticket for no better reason than he wears buttons on the sleeves of his coat. He may

rationalize his behavior — he may say that the Republican party is the party of freedom and protection, that it "fought the war and saved the Union," that it stands for a big navy and a vigorous foreign policy — but the real reason for his being a Republican lies in the fact that he was reared in a Republican home. Another factor of great importance is the influence of neighborhood groups. It takes a strong personality indeed to be a Republican when one's friends and business associates are Democrats. Countless illustrations could be cited of persons who vote for one party or the other simply because they reside in a Democratic or Republican region.

The hereditary nature of political allegiance is illustrated in the fact that ten southern states, except in 1928, have consistently voted Democratic in every election since 1880, and eleven northern states have been Republican since 1892.

Out of a total of 433 Congressional districts in the United States, 316 are one-party districts, that is to say, are either safely Republican or safely Democratic. A majority of these are classified as rural. Of a total of 117 doubtful districts, only 47 are rural. Political orthodoxy is more prevalent in rural areas. This is to be expected, since it is in the country that family influences are strongest.

Race plays some part. The Negroes cannot forget that Lincoln and the Republicans freed them from slavery. One reason for the fact that the whites in the South are such faithful Democrats is that the blacks are Republicans. Other racial and nationalistic groups, however, seem to present no very marked preference for one or the other party, although Germans and Scandinavians tend toward Republicanism.

Religion plays only a minor part in distinguishing Repub-

licans from Democrats. Catholics and Protestants, Jews and Gentiles, are found in both parties. Candidates who denounce any religious group stand in grave danger of alienating members of the same faith in their own party. When a New York clergyman in 1884 characterized the Democrats as the party of "rum, Romanism, and rebellion," he is said to have offended a large number of Catholic voters and to have cost Blaine the election through the loss of New York. In 1924 a bitter fight was staged in the Democratic convention over a proposal to condemn the Ku Klux Klan. The Democrats of New York City, where the convention was held, with their large Jewish and Catholic following, were desirous of denouncing the Klan by name. It was felt, however, that to do so would jeopardize the chances of the party in the Klan-ridden Protestant South. Consequently, a vague resolution was adopted reaffirming the Democratic principle that "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office of public trust under the United States." But that religious prejudices count in American politics and count heavily, the 1928 election has clearly demonstrated. Even here, though, religious differences were insufficient in most southern states, to offset the influence of traditional loyalty to the Democratic party.

In one sense the Republican and Democratic parties are myths. Both include innumerable minor groups which have no more in common than the lust for power and the fruits of political control. It is, for example, customary to speak of Minnesota, Iowa, Wisconsin, and the Dakotas as safe Republican territory. But the Republicanism of these states is as different from the Republicanism of Pennsylvania and Maine as anything can be. To classify Senators Brookhart,

La Follette, Norris, Shipstead, and Nye as Republican is, to say the least, confusing. Their interpretation of what the Republican party should stand for is as different from the interpretation of Senators Reed, of Pennsylvania, and Moses, of New Hampshire, as the modernist interpretation of the Bible is from that of the fundamentalists. An attempt was made in November, 1924, to purge the party of these mavericks. The Republican caucus of that year ousted Senators Brookhart, Ladd, Frazier, and La Follette from the party and resolved that they "be not invited to future Republican conferences, and be not named to fill any Republican vacancies in Senate committees." This raises a nice question. What is a Republican? Since the party has few, if any, real principles, no definite answer can be given. As the New York *World* remarked, such a question "sets the stage for a new ecclesiastical debate more finely drawn than the medieval wrangles in which good churchmen sought to determine how many angels could be accommodated on a pin." The same is true of the Democrats. Only by a polite fiction can one classify "Al" Smith and "Tom" Heflin as members of the same party. The necessity for a nation-wide organization in the election of the President and the two-party tradition which prevails in America force these divergent personalities and principles into the same party bed.

The amount of reason in political behavior is almost microscopic. Obviously in the "safe" Democratic and Republican districts the voter is governed by his bias, not by his brains. What about the doubtful districts? There, if anywhere, one would expect to find the voters listening to the voice of reason. It is significant that most of these districts are in the regions where winter wheat and corn are the

staple crops. This is not surprising. These crops depend upon uncontrollable forces of nature, and the farmers, when the sun or rain fails them or the grasshoppers "eat them out," turn agin' the government. These rebel voters resemble the savage who beats his idol when it fails to grant his prayer. When crops are good, and prices high, they return to the traditional party fold like docile sheep.*

In both the older parties there are radicals and conservatives, a left wing and a right wing. We have seen that according to one theory radicals and conservatives are born such. Another explanation attributes radicalism to poverty and conservatism to prosperity. Certainly, periods of unemployment, high prices, low wages, and agricultural depression have coincided in the United States with "radical" movements. But this does not justify conservatives in look-

* Mr. Robert Marshall has worked out an ingenious correlation between rainfall and presidential succession. His figures follow:

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION AND PRECIPITATION IN THE NORTHEAST

Date	Precipitation		Presidential Succession
	Amount in Inches	Relation to Normal	
1825-1828	42.28	—	Change
1829-1832	46.08	+	Continuation
1833-1836	37.47	—	Continuation
1837-1840	37.98	—	Change
1841-1844	40.25	—	Change
1845-1848	40.36	—	Change
1849-1852	42.92	—	Change
1853-1856	43.59	+	Continuation
1857-1860	44.49	+	Change
1861-1864	45.10	+	Continuation
1865-1868	46.12	+	Continuation
1869-1872	47.89	+	Continuation
1873-1876	44.13	+	Continuation
1877-1880	43.38	+	Continuation
1881-1884	42.27	—	Change
Mean	42.95		

ing upon radicals as a species of lunatic, ignorant and unthinking. Indeed there seems to be some reason to believe that people who are consistently radical are actually better informed on public questions than are conservatives. The writer made a study of the opinions on public questions of some three thousand college students. Each student answered not only an opinion test but also an information test based upon the opinions. We shall not here enter into the methods employed, but the results show that invariably the radical student actually knew more about the subject than the conservative.

The success of the Labor party in England leads one to

The same situation was found to prevail in the seven West North Central States during the period from 1885-1924.

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION AND PRECIPITATION IN THE WEST NORTH CENTRAL STATES

Date	Precipitation		Presidential Succession
	Amount in Inches	Relation to Normal	
1885-1888	26.48	—	Change
1889-1892	26.21	—	Change
1893-1896	24.61	—	Change
1897-1900	27.88	+	Continuation
1901-1904	28.90	+	Continuation
1905-1908	29.61	+	Continuation
1909-1912	25.01	—	Change
1913-1916	27.95	+	Continuation
1917-1920	25.02	—	Change
1921-1924	26.24	—	Continuation
Mean	26.79		

"Summing up the records of the two regions over a period of 100 years," says Mr. Marshall, "in 22 cases out of 25 the quadrennial rainfall predicted the next President. . . . It can be shown statistically that were chance alone operating the probability of coincidence between precipitation and Presidential succession in 22 cases out of 25 would be only 1 in 14,603."

To explain these phenomena Mr. Marshall says: "Scant rainfall means poor crops, poor crops mean hard times, and hard times mean discontent." See the *Nation*, March 23, 1927.

ask why there is no similar organization in the United States. The machinery is in existence for such a party. The American Federation of Labor, with a total membership of over 3,000,000 and with 31,000 local units, should be able to wield considerable political power. There have been numerous attempts at the formation of a Labor party, but with very little success. In certain localities they have been temporarily successful, but in the national field they have rarely "cut much ice." The Socialist party had at one time a good organization and succeeded in 1912 in polling 900,000 votes, but the war and post-war prosperity dealt it a death blow. There are many factors which stand in the way of an independent Labor party in the United States. With the exception of the 1924 campaign, it has been the policy of the American Federation of Labor leaders to work through the regular parties, throwing their support to the party most friendly to labor. The influence of tradition is felt here as elsewhere. Workers are no exception to the rule that people vote as their fathers did. In the case of the foreign-born workers, they fall readily under the domination of the astute managers of the regular party machines. Most of the gains made by organized labor have come through direct action — the strike — and the worker is consequently impatient of political action. Then too, labor lacks its own newspapers and propaganda agencies, relying for the most part upon the "capitalist" Press for its news. This, of course, is not conducive to political independence. Employers are in a position to coerce the workers into voting for the regular party candidates. During the Bryan campaign of 1896 many employers told their workers that if Bryan was elected the plants would close down. The fear of losing their jobs keeps many from

"kicking over the traces." * The older parties have unlimited means. Labor organizations are notoriously poor by comparison, and in American politics it is invariably the party with the richest "war chest" which wins. The workers are handicapped by the fact that they are concentrated in the large cities, which are grossly underrepresented in our state legislatures and in Congress.

Perhaps more important than all is the inherent conservatism of American labor. Most workers are incipient capitalists. The belief that success in America is the result of individual effort has been drilled into them by the School, the Church, and the Press; and anything which smacks of class consciousness is frowned upon as anti-American.

The attempts made from time to time to unite labor and the farmer into an independent party have proved abortive. The American farmer owns property and machinery which, although usually encumbered with a heavy mortgage, place him, psychologically at least, in the propertied class. He hires labor and regards himself as a capitalist. It is only during times of severe economic depression that he is at all sympathetic with the aims of labor. A good harvest or two with fairly good prices for his products, and he leaves the labor lorry for the Republican or Democratic bandwagon. For the most part minor and third-party movements have constituted "trial balloons" for the older organizations. They

* See Paxton Hibben, *The Peerless Leader—William Jennings Bryan*, N.Y., 1929, p. 200: "As the month of November drew near, capitalists resorted to the very effective device of carrying large orders to manufacturers on condition that these orders should be executed only in case of McKinley's election. In this way notice was served on artisans that if they voted for Mr. Bryan they would be voting to deprive themselves of work. At the end of the week preceding the election many employers of labor in paying off their workmen gave them notice that they could not return to work in the event of Mr. Bryan's success."

are the "pillars of fire" which the Republicans and Democrats, in due time and at a distance, follow into the promised land of political and economic reform. Abolition, prohibition, interstate commerce regulation, Federal income tax, direct election of Senators, and woman suffrage are some of the ideas which the older parties "filched" from these minor prophets.

To organize a new national political party would be a herculean task. Any such movement must compete with the highly organized, well-financed, and historically intrenched Republican and Democratic machines.

It is necessary to distinguish between those who vote for the party candidates and the professional politicians who "run the machine." They are the people who constitute the state, district, county, ward, and precinct committees of the party, and upon whose shoulders rests the burden of "leading the hosts to victory." This elaborate organization is held together by a judicious distribution of "loaves and fishes." Aside from some fifty thousand elective offices, which are largely at the disposal of the party managers, there are thousands of appointive jobs in the public service which go to those who work for the party. The Democratic machine in New York City, otherwise known as Tammany, may be taken as an illustration. Practically all of the district leaders are on the public pay roll with salaries ranging from $1,500 to $15,000 a year. According to Joseph McGoldrick in the *American Mercury* of September, 1928,

> The district leader is the anode and the cathode of Tammany's political battery. He brings it its money and its votes. . . . The organization has little contact with the citizenry. To the vast masses of the common people and most of the rest, the district

leader is the chief point of contact with the organization, even with the government itself. Every night in the week, every week in the year, they can find him in his clubhouse during the entire evening. . . . The next day he is busy about the courts, seeing clerks, district attorneys, and judges, or better still, the leaders responsible for them. He sees commissioner this or chief clerk that and arranges for peddler's licenses, excuses for jury duty, transfers, reinstatements, the promotion of subordinates, vault permits, sewer connections, revision of assessments."

"The club," says McGoldrick, "is a soviet of political job-holders." The same condition prevails in the Republican organization and in political machines throughout the country.

How can such a machine be broken? Since the party's main function, in the absence of definite principles, is the presentation of candidates, obviously the power to nominate them is decisive. Formerly the candidates were named in boss-controlled and often corrupt conventions. To break this monopoly, thirty-nine states have enacted direct primary laws which permit the rank and file of party adherents to have a voice in the selection of the nominees. Unquestionably this marks an improvement over the convention system, but it has by no means broken the power of the machine. In many instances it has merely complicated the voter's problem and made his task more difficult. "In the New York primary of March 26, 1912, the Democratic ballot was fourteen feet long. To vote a split ticket involved placing a mark before each of 590 names within a time limit of three minutes." As a matter of fact the voters take less interest in primaries than in the final elections, notwithstanding that in one-party districts the nomination is equivalent to election.

The machine usually succeeds in having its own candi-

dates nominated. How is this done? Frank Kent estimates that in an average precint election, only 65 votes are necessary to control, although the precinct usually numbers some 400 to 600 voters. Of these not more than 250 will normally belong to either party, and only about 125 are likely to vote in the primary. The leader can thus "swing" any precinct election by controlling 65 votes. How does he get the necessary votes? First, he can count on his own family and relatives for at least five. His power to select the two judges and the clerk of election, each of whom is paid by the state from eight to twelve dollars a day, assures him of three more. The families of these three will increase the number to fifteen. Five more can be gained by the choice of a polling place, for which the state pays an average of $100 rent. The party furnishes him with money to pay runners and messengers to aid in getting out the vote, and this takes care of ten more. "He is still shy some 30 votes. But he has not yet counted the officeholders. There are in every precinct some of these, and they mostly hold their jobs because of the recommendation of the precinct executive." Voters include street cleaners, policemen, firemen, clerks in government departments, state employees, and aspirants for these jobs. "There are very few precincts anywhere in which there are not at least ten persons living who are under party organization obligations." These with their families are sufficient to complete the quota of 65 votes and to insure victory for the machine. This is the procedure followed to a greater or lesser degree in every one of the 150,000 precincts in America.

One obvious remedy for this situation is to arouse the rank and file of the voters to take an active interest in primary elections. This cannot be done so long as party

battles are regarded as of no more significance than medicine shows.

However bitter the fight may be in the primary, once the machine has spoken and the candidate is nominated, all differences are buried and the organization presents a united front. During the Pennsylvania primary of 1926 W. L. Mellon, John S. Fisher, and Senators Pepper and Reed vigorously opposed the nomination of W. S. Vare. Senator Pepper said of him:

> He is the Jonah of this organization. . . . What the organization needs is to be delivered from Vare. Up state, where every respectable person speaks of the Philadelphia organization with disgust, the explanation ought to be made that it is Vare that gives it its bad name.

W. L. Mellon, on April 20, made the following statement:

> The issue is extremely important, for the result of the election on May 18 will determine if Mr. Vare or the people are to run the state of Pennsylvania.

John S. Fisher, on April 30, referred to Vare as one

> whose statesmanship is not above that of the mere mob. Can you imagine anything more ridiculous or more shameful than a man who makes a complete platform out of a beer mug?

Yet when Vare was nominated, all of these persons united solidly behind him in the subsequent election.

The foregoing illustrates the tactics by which the party organization is held together. When it comes to the campaign, the contest resolves itself into a struggle between two machines for control of the government. In "safe" districts the primary, for practical purposes, ends the matter and the machine wins "hands down." It is only in the doubtful dis-

tricts that any real struggle takes place, and the rival machines make their appeal to the so-called independent voters, the people "on the fence." They appeal to their self-interest, their fear, their pet prejudices, and their suppressed desires. In the first place, the platform is concocted by the "best minds" of the party not as an honest declaration of principles but as bait to catch the "floaters." Nine times out of ten it is a compound of pious pronouncements concerning things about which no sane men could disagree, and sentimental slogans designed to appeal to the emotions of the mob. The platform of the party in power always "points with pride" to its notable record of public service, and the "outs" always deplore the "betrayal of the people" by the "ins." In 1928, for example, the Republicans declared: "The Republican Party . . . presents to the people of the nation this platform of its principles, based on a record of its accomplishments, and asks and awaits a new vote of confidence." The Democrats, on the other hand, had this to say: "Never in the entire history of the country has there occurred in any given period of time, or indeed in all time put together, such a spectacle of sordid corruption and unabashed rascality as that which has characterized the administration of Federal affairs under the eight blighting years of Republican rule." Both parties claim credit for whatever is good under the sun and blame their opponents for everything from an early frost to floods and famines. There are planks appealing to the immigrant groups of the cities, such as those demanding justice for Ireland or protection for Armenia, to the drys as well as to the wets, to labor and to capital, to militarists and pacifists, and especially in recent years to the farmer. In endeavoring to please all classes and

groups the platform becomes exceedingly complicated and vague. The Republican platform of 1920 contained upwards of fifty different issues, and the platforms of 1928 made mention of no less than forty-eight. Above all, the platform must please the business and commercial classes from which the bulk of the campaign funds come. Both parties appeal to the hero worship of the crowd. The Republicans always refer to themselves as the party of Lincoln, and the Democrats invariably "reaffirm our devotion to the principles of Democratic government formulated by Jefferson."

More important than the formulation of the platform, however, is the selection of the candidate. First and foremost, he must be regular, a lifelong member of the party. He must be one who will "play the game," that is, distribute the spoils of office to "deserving" Democrats or Republicans as the case may be. He must be a man who has many friends and few enemies, or at least his enemies must be among the politically inconsequential. It is better if he has never declared himself forcibly upon any question more controversial than the preservation of the home and the sacredness of motherhood. Physically the large man has the advantage over the small man. Like Caesar, the public is suspicious of long, lean men.* The candidate should be a "joiner." The

* The relation between size and leadership extends to other fields than politics. Some interesting data in this connection was published in 1915 in *The Executive and His Control of Men*, by E. B. Gowin. It was discovered that the average weight of the governors of forty-six states was 182 pounds; sixty-one university presidents weighed on the average 181.6 pounds. There seems to be some relation between the size of the leader and the importance of the position he fills. For instance, it was found that bishops weighed an average of 176.4 pounds, whereas preachers in small towns weighed only 159.4 pounds; university presidents weighed an average of 181.6 pounds, and presidents of small colleges weighed only 164 pounds; city school superintendents averaged 178.6 pounds, and principals in small towns only 157.6 pounds. Presidents of state bar associa-

more lodges and fraternities he belongs to, the better. If he is an Elk, an Eagle, an Owl, a Moose, a Mason, and if possible a member of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows, he will make a strong candidate. It is imperative in most cases that he be a Protestant. He must not be too poor, but he must have "begun life as a poor boy." If he can point to a farm log cabin as his birthplace, his success is almost a foregone conclusion. The American people have not yet come to regard poverty and the city streets as a good foundation for successful statesmanship. Preferably the candidate should be married and have a family, for that is a guarantee of "good morals." The morals of unmarried men past thirty are always more or less under a cloud. The candidate should, if possible, come from a doubtful area. The leaders of the party do not want to waste a nomination by naming a man from a safe district. This is the reason so many Presidential candidates come from Ohio. Seven of the thirteen men who have lived in the White House since 1869 have been born in Ohio, and six lived there when nominated.* Pride in the "native son" will often sway enough "independent" voters to win the state. While the candidate must be prosperous, he must not be too rich and he must avoid like the plague any connection with that hobgoblin, "Wall Street." It is best if he is a man of temperate habits; and if he smokes, it

tions weighed 171.5 pounds, and county attorneys 162.4 pounds; sales managers on the average weighed 182.8 pounds, and salesmen only 157 pounds, while railroad presidents weighed an average of 186.3 pounds, whereas station agents weighed only 154.6 pounds. Equally significant perhaps is the fact that authors, philosophers, and psychologists weighed the least of any of the groups studied, and presidents of fraternal organizations were the heaviest.

* Of 58 major candidates for the offices of President and Vice President in the period from 1876 to 1928, New York, Ohio, and Indiana have supplied 34. See Merriam and Gosnell, *The American Party System*, N. Y., 1929.

should not be cigarettes, for in spite of millions of dollars of advertising, cigarette manufacturers have not yet freed their product entirely from its association with the wanton and wastrel.

Elaborate accounts of the candidate's life, listing his sterling virtues, are circulated by the thousands. Every important candidate is represented as the reincarnation of the nation's great political prophets and saints. Alfred E. Smith becomes a resurrected Jefferson with the mind of a Wilson and the virile virtues of Andrew Jackson. Hoover is no less than a composite of Lincoln, Washington, Hamilton, and Roosevelt. Here is an account giving the "Picture Life of a Great American," or the life of Herbert Hoover. It says: "Chapters touching his early life are typically American, the story of many heroic figures in our national annals — a boyhood of bereavement, self-support while gaining an education, and early recognition among men as a leader. Now he is a lad of ten, left an orphan in a little Iowa village. . . . At thirteen he is earning his way through public school. At seventeen he is the pioneer student at Leland Stanford. . . . At twenty he is mucking ore as a miner." He is depicted as the partner of the American housewife, advocate of high wages and better homes. Throughout the "history" are pictures showing the high points in his career. On the other hand, Alfred Smith is pictured as an ideal family man, lover of children and animals, poor boy who by his own unaided efforts became governor of New York, and champion of the "people's rights." He is the enemy of privilege and pillage but the true friend of all legitimate business, as the support of Du Pont, Raskob, Young, and others proves.

In making his appeal to the voters the candidate relies

largely on vague generalities and sheer "bunk." He promises everything. When his opponent asks embarrassing questions, he either does not reply at all or "changes the subject." When, during the 1928 campaign, Smith asked Mr. Hoover what he proposed to do with reference to the development of hydroelectric power at Muscle Shoals and Boulder Dam, Hoover replied by denouncing Socialism. In 1924 both the major party candidates denounced La Follette as a dangerous person, who was striking at the pillars of the Republic, without making any effort to meet the specific charges which La Follette leveled against them. In the 1928 campaign when Smith was attacked for his wet views by the Anti-Saloon League and the Methodist Board of Temperance, Prohibition, and Public Morals, he replied by charging his critics with religious bigotry and intolerance.

Since most Americans are nominally Christian, it is always good tactics to appeal to God — but highly dangerous to appeal to or denounce particular sects. It is likewise risky to attack openly the private life of one's opponent. During the gubernatorial campaign of 1926 in New York, Ogden Mills, the Republican candidate, in an unguarded moment, declared that Smith could not be trusted in either public or private life. This gave Smith an opportunity to appear abused, and to appeal to the voter's sense of "fair play." In his Bronx speech the night following the Mills statement, Smith said: "I'll compare my private life with Congressman Mills' or any other man's, I care not who he is." The governor paused, and then with solemnity went on: "Twenty-seven years ago I knelt before the altar . . . and in the presence of God Almighty promised to care for, honor, and protect the woman of my choice. And if I suddenly was

ushered tonight before the Great White Throne I would be prepared to establish that I had kept that promise. Let the Congressman lay his private life alongside of mine." Of course he brought down the house. Mills the next day published a lame retraction. If you want to attack your opponent's private life, whisper it.

The public likes a good show, and the experienced politician is a master at giving it. "Big" Bill Thompson, in his campaign for mayor of Chicago, illustrates clearly the technique. He promised to "kick King George out of Chicago," and to the Irish this meant, of course, King George of England, but to the radical Protestants it meant "King" George Mundelein, Catholic Cardinal of Chicago. Thompson, says Kate Sargent, "has an extraordinary understanding of mob psychology. . . . He knew that the great collective boy, the mob, loves a parade or a circus. It loves to carry a banner and shout a war whoop." To this mob Thompson could say, "Here I am!" He wears a huge sombrero, which for some unaccountable reason is supposed to make him "democratic" and to indicate that he has the interests of the common man at heart. He has, of course, the initial advantage of large size. On the platform he referred to himself as "Big Bill." In the primary of 1926, when he was electioneering for Senator McKinley, two of his opponents were "Doc" Robertson and Fred Lundin. Thompson brought two live rats with him to a political rally and dubbed them "Doc" and "Fred." Shaking his finger at one, he cried reproachfully. "Fred, let me ask you something. Wasn't I the best friend you ever had? Isn't it true that I came home from Honolulu to save you from the penitentiary?" Speaking of "Doc" Robertson, he said: "The Doc is slinging mud. I'm not descending to

personalities, but let me tell you, if you want to see a nasty sight, you watch Doc Robertson eating in a restaurant. Eggs in his whiskers, soup on his vest; you'd think the Doc got his education driving a garbage wagon."

Referring to Edward R. Litsinger, his opponent for nomination in the Republican primaries, Thompson said: "The man who doesn't take a bath. Says he rubs himself with oil. Perhaps that's why he's so slippery." The audience was delighted. Concerning Thompson's political methods Lundin remarked: "If you ask him to state his position on the alliance between crime and politics, you may expect him to say, 'I am for America first.' Ask him about his abandonment of people's ownership of the traction lines and the five-cent fare, and he will answer, if at all, by crying, 'Down with the League of Nations!' Ask Thompson why he has turned his back on the small home owner of moderate means and has lined up with the millionaire tax-dodger whom he used to denounce, his only answer will be 'I shall refuse to sing *God Save the King.*'" Countless other illustrations might be cited. Roland G. Hartley in his campaign for governor of Washington toured the state carrying two of the "gold" spittoons upon which a reckless legislature had squandered the "people's money." Frank Kent cites the case of John Phillip Hill of Baltimore, a confirmed wet, in his campaign for Congress: "Stalking into a crowded hall, Mr. Hill would walk to the table on the stage where, under his instructions, a pitcher of water and a glass had been placed. Picking up the pitcher he would start to pour himself a drink. Suddenly and dramatically he would throw the water out of the window or dash the glass on the floor. 'What's this?' he would shout. 'Water? We don't want water in this district. We

want beer; and boys, if you send John Phillip Hill to Congress he'll get it for you.' Then he would grab an American flag (also planted), the band would strike up, and the crowd go crazy." He was elected. Mr. Coolidge pitching hay, kissing babies, and "dolling up" in his cowboy outfit and Al Smith at the newsboys' banquet are other illustrations.

Without directly accusing your opponent of acts offensive to the crowd, it is none the less possible to blight his reputation. The following is from a campaign circular of a candidate for constable in Knox County, Kentucky:

> George Bright has not been indicted for stealing chickens; he has not been indicted for tying his horse on the railroad track to obtain money under false pretenses; he has not been indicted for being out with street or woods women; he has not been indicted for selling whiskey; he has never been in jail; nor has my father had to go crazy and to the asylum to keep me from the penitentiary.
>
> I have never asked my opponent to join the K.K.K. and help run the Negroes out of their homes, so we could get us some homes give to us. I have never run around telling lies, and I have never stolen Mrs. Grindstaff's cow.
>
> So, men and women, don't vote for my opponent. He is not fit to be in jail, much less in public office.
>
> I am not like my opponent. I have a good character, and every day I am the same man. So give me a vote. I am the people's friend.
>
> GEORGE BRIGHT

During the 1928 campaign in the South, Republicans were said to have hired Negroes to walk through the streets of towns and cities carrying Al Smith banners. The implication being that Smith, although a Democrat, was a "Nigger lover."

No candidate can hope to be successful in American politics if he regards himself as "above the average." He must be not above the mob or below it but *in* it and *of* it. Frank Kent cites the following advice to candidates from a member of the Republican National Committee and "as wise a politician as can be found." He says:

It is bad publicity to get overpraised in the favorable Press. The people are suspicious of the man they are told is perfect. . . . The people do not like a "blue blood" or an aristocrat.

It is bad publicity to convey the impression of superiority . . . particularly of intellectual superiority. Be a little dumb. . . .

It is good publicity to appear abused or unfairly treated by the Press. It is good publicity to have some one attack you in the Press as stupid or as a demagogue or as uneducated or ignorant or financially embarrassed. All of these things create sympathy, and sympathy sways the voter. . . .

The best publicity is a pleasant human-interest story of a candidate. If a little romance can be injected into it, so much the better. . . .

Novelty ads, like stickers, marked pencils, toy balloons, etc., are ineffective. . . . A slogan favorable to your side or prejudicial to the other, constantly repeated, is good.

A letter from a fairly well-known member of the opposing party, giving the reasons why he regrets he cannot support the candidates of his own party in the present election, mailed to all members of his party within four or five blocks of his residence, has been worked with good effect. . . .

[Ward and district meetings are not as good as] city-wide meetings. . . . In the larger meetings you can procure real talent, and "class" makes its appeal in politics as elsewhere.

Never put your opponent on the front page. If you have him licked, don't advertise him.

It is good business to provoke an attack rather than let the other side ignore you. And it is better to be attacked than to attack. The idea that the thing to do is to make an aggressive

campaign is the bunk. The fellow on the defensive is the fellow who gets the sympathy. They warm to the under dog.

This is a somewhat hasty and inadequate picture of the "great game of politics" as it is played in the United States.

Chapter VII

PRESSURE AND PROPAGANDA

"Representative government," said a prominent American educator, "can only be successfully worked by the two-party system — not by blocs and groups." One is tempted to say that precisely the reverse of this is true. A two-party system, however necessary to the smooth functioning of modern legislatures, cannot possibly give representation to the many and contradictory opinions which at any given time are present in society. It is impossible for the Republican or Democratic party to represent at the same time the vital interests of organized labor and capital, the wets of the city and the drys of the country, the pacifists and the militarists. In their efforts to satisfy all of these divergent groups, the parties have come to represent not clear-cut principles but vague generalities which for practical purposes are meaningless.

Within our legislatures representatives group themselves not only as Democrats and Republicans but as farmers, bankers, manufacturers, wets, drys, conservatives, and radicals. It is as rival blocs that they come to grips. An analysis of the votes in legislative bodies reveals that members cast their ballots consistently for or against proposed legislation in accordance with the particular group to which they belong. Thus the wets on one side and the drys on the other, whether they be Republicans or Democrats, may be depended

upon to vote together on legislation affecting prohibition. The manufacturers' group is composed of both Republicans and Democrats. Likewise, the labor or "radical" group includes members of both parties. Senators La Follette, Norris, and Brookhart, nominally Republicans, will be found voting with Wheeler, Dill, and Walsh of Massachusetts, nominally Democrats. In European legislative bodies these blocs are openly recognized, but in America they function under the fiction of a two-party system.

"Just as I stand for . . . the American system of responsible party government," says Nicholas Longworth, Speaker of the House of Representatives, "I am against the European system of bloc government. . . . Here it won't work, because it is un-American." Mr. Longworth at the time was denouncing the farm bloc in the Congress of 1924. "In reality," says Professor Sait, "the farm bloc was doing more or less openly just what bipartisan groups had done secretly in the past in the service of the railroads and other capitalist interests." During the 1924 campaign John W. Davis, Democratic candidate for President said: "It is ignorant or insincere to cry out against the farm bloc in Congress as if it were a new thing. Each succeeding Republican administration has been a government by an industrial bloc."

These legislative blocs are only a reflection of countless similar blocs among the body of our citizens. Behind each of them will be found an organization of men and women united upon some particular public policy. We are perhaps the most highly organized nation on earth. "We join everything," says Charles Merz in *The Great American Band Wagon.* "We join the Gideons and the Rotarians and the Kiwanians and the Democrats and the Republicans and the

Single Taxers and the Epworth Leaguers and the Friends of Self-Determination for Rhodesia, to say nothing of almost innumerable country clubs and luncheon clubs and discussion clubs and societies for the prevention of this and the prevention of that and the achievement of the other." It used to be said that two Germans could not meet without founding a club. It might with equal truth be said that two Americans cannot agree on anything without founding an organization and hiring a lobbyist. Everyone has heard of the Anti-Saloon League. But the League is only one of countless similar organizations seeking to influence legislation and opinion. There is an American Bankers' Association and a Hod Carriers' Union, a Chamber of Commerce of the United States and the American Federation of Labor, an Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the Ku Klux Klan, the Lords' Day Alliance and the Association against the Blue Laws, the Anti-Saloon League and the Association against the Prohibition Amendment. Washington is overrun with them. Mr. E. P. Herring, in a recent study of *Group Representation before Congress*, lists some five hundred with permanent headquarters in the capital and says there are probably a thousand. There is even a National Circus Fans' Association. It is through such organizations that the ordinary citizen finds his true representation. Public opinion in any other sense than organized group opinion is pretty much of a phantom.

For the most part these organizations do not draw party lines. They work through the Republican as well as the Democratic party. All political creeds and beliefs are grist for their mills so long as they "get what they want."

In the enactment of tariff legislation the National Manu-

facturers' Association not infrequently has a controlling voice. The representatives of this group, and of the various industries which it represents, appear before Congressional committees and literally write the law. "Since 1875," says Henry Loomis Nelson, "Congress has not legislated on the tariff: it has merely affirmed or ratified the decrees of the beneficiaries of the tariff."

Speaking of the Fordney-McCumber Bill in 1923, Senator Underwood said: "It looks as if those charged with the responsibility of writing the bill have accepted unqualifiedly the rates proposed by the special interests desiring protection and have not given consideration to the resultant . . . burdens that must be borne by the consumer of America." As the New York *Nation* of March 6, 1929, put it:

> The tariff boys come one by one,
> To the Ways and Means Committee;
> They wipe away a righteous tear
> As they sing their soulful ditty:
>
> A duty here and a duty there
> And a compound rate on hankies;
> May foreign buttons never fill
> The buttonholes of Yankees.
>
> Hoist up the rate on shoes from Prague
> And straw hats from Milan;
> Do your *ad valorem* duty
> On those uppers from Japan.
>
> Oh, some give everything for love,
> And others live for beauty;
> But the tariff hound, from Grundy down,
> Knows only one word: Duty.*

* The Congressional investigation of 1913 revealed that the National Council for Industrial Defense, a manufacturers' organization, had spent

The Anti-Saloon League literally wrote the eighteenth amendment and the Volstead Act. During a debate on the Webb Bill in 1912, a Kentucky member of Congress remarked: "This sham and pretense of a prohibition law is about to be written upon the statute books of the nation because the Anti-Saloon League has so decreed." Concerning the League, Donald Wilhelm wrote in 1926: "One falters, one's typewriter sticks, when one tries to give expression to the evangelical, marching-through-Georgia, Hallelujah, God-Save-Us spirit of this organization which perhaps more than any other has succeeded in imposing its will upon the government."

The American Farm Bureau Federation organized the farm bloc in Congress, which from 1921 to 1923 held the balance of power. Through this bloc the Federation exerted and continues to exert, tremendous influence on legislation. The Soldiers' Bonus Act of 1924, on the other hand, was largely due to the influence of the American Legion.

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States, with an underlying membership of some 850,000 corporations, firms, and individuals, is by all odds the most important of the business groups. When it speaks Congress listens, for it "speaks with the voice of one having authority." It played a conspicuous part in the enactment of the Budget Law, the Federal Reserve Act, the Transportation Act of 1920, and the Federal Water Power Act of 1920. According to

$1,500,000 in six years to mold public opinion and promote legislation. The sugar trust had spent $750,000 fighting the Cuban reciprocity treaty. Since 1921 the United States Beet Sugar Association has spent over $500,000 to prevent any lowering of the tariff on sugar. In 1929 ten American sugar companies with holdings in Cuba expended about $100,000 on a campaign to lower the tariff.

Charles G. Dawes, "The Chamber served as a focus for budget plans, and came to be a radiant center of information about them. It made articulate the wishes of American business men." Hon. William C. Redfield, former Secretary of Commerce, wrote in 1925: "Today its [the Chamber of Commerce's] touch is constant with Congress and the departments." It is no exaggeration to say that the Chamber has virtually become an integral part of the government. The motto of the Chamber of Commerce, "What's good for business is good for the country," with slight variations might serve as a slogan for all of these associations. It is a common failing of men to believe that what's sauce for the goose must be sauce for the gander.

There are dozens of Trade Associations, from the American Petroleum Institute to the Waxed Paper Manufacturers' Association, which have officials in Washington to look out for the interests of their members. There are hundreds of "reform" groups agitating for bigger and better battleships, for disarmament, for better babies.* The women are represented by no less than thirty separate organizations, the most militant of which are the League of

* It has but recently been revealed that three American shipbuilding corporations paid Mr. William Baldwin Shearer $25,000 to "represent" them at disarmament meetings in Geneva. The collapse of the Coolidge disarmament conference in 1927 has been attributed to his activities. He was also employed along with others to carry on an active campaign for a bigger navy. "As the result of my activities, during the sixty-ninth Congress," said Mr. Shearer, "eight 10,000-ton cruisers are now under construction." It was admitted that he had been employed to lobby for the Fifteen-Cruiser Bill of 1928-29 and that $143,000 had been spent on lobbying for the Merchant Marine Act of 1928.

On the other hand, during consideration of the Kellogg treaty, United States Senators received ten thousand resolutions from women's organizations urging ratification.

See "Lobbies and American Legislation," by the author, *Current History,* January, 1930.

Women Voters and the W. C. T. U. We have already mentioned in another connection the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ and the National Catholic Welfare Conference. To cite only the more important associations, there are thirteen representing trade and industry; ten, agriculture; eight, labor; ten, the professions; nine, women; eight, "reform"; and eleven, defense and disarmament. The guns of these speak with a reverberating roar, but there are hundreds of others which wage a sort of guerilla warfare, sniping from behind the skirts of the larger associations.

These groups constitute what was formerly called the "invisible government." According to William Allen White:

> The Constitution has been supplanted and we have two kinds of government — our political government, which is supposed to be in the hands of a majority of the people; and a group of organized minorities, sometimes working together, sometimes at each other's throats, making a vast uncontrolled but tremendously powerful, invisible government — the government of minorities.

But they are no longer invisible. "In the evolution of the legislative functions of our government," said a recent speaker before the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, "there has developed a recognized third house; not the third house of fraud and bribery, but the third house that states its desires openly and fairly. This third house is composed of organizations such as the United States Chamber of Commerce, the National Education Association, the National Manufacturers' Association, the American Bankers' Association, the labor groups, and the agricultural groups. These bodies openly and intelligently further the interests of those whom they represent."

It is not only the national government which feels the influence of such groups. In every state countless associations bring pressure to bear upon legislatures and public officials. In a message to the Wisconsin legislature in 1905 Governor La Follette said: "No one acquainted with the facts will venture to deny that the lobby has been very potent in legislation for many years in Wisconsin. . . . [A railway lobbyist once proclaimed that] 'no bill has been enacted into law during the sixteen years last past in the interests of the people when objected to by the railroads.' " *

When Clyde M. Reed became governor of Kansas in 1928 he started a campaign against these lobbies. In a letter given to the Press and sent to state, county, and city officials he said: "At the close of the last session of the legislature the governor of the state publicly described the situation as follows:

> The railroads and the associated industries are riding for a hard fall. One or two more sessions of the legislature such as the last one and they will have the people ready for a revolution.
>
> The corporation lobby has begun early this year. It has already had a big booze party at one of the principal hotels in Topeka. At this party were eight state senators, four railroad attorneys, representatives of the Bell Telephone Company, and other public utility and corporation representatives. At this party were discussed committee assignments in the senate and plans for opposing the incoming administration in its efforts to carry out a constructive program to which the Republican party of the state is pledged.

* During the 1928 session of the New York Legislature 40 legislative agents were present in Albany. In Massachusetts 77 were registered. At a recent session in California 127 lobbyists were on hand, and in 1925 in Ohio 170 were registered.

"Throughout the sessions of the legislature in recent years the growing use of booze parties given by lobbyists with the intention of influencing legislation has become a matter of common knowledge and apprehension."

This form of political persuasion has not ceased. Robert B. Prather, a lobbyist for the Illinois public utilities, once wrote to his chief: "The legislature is in session here and it looks like a very stormy session and I could use a little J. Walker to very good advantage." He requested a half dozen bottles. In another letter he asked for "something to sweeten the palates of the legislature." Under cross-examination Prather said: "Do you suppose that six bottles of Johnny Walker would go very far among two hundred members of the Illinois legislature?"

But booze and bribery are crude methods, ineffective and obsolete. Today the chief guns in the artillery of these organizations are pressure and propaganda. Attorneys are hired to appear before legislative committees to argue for and against legislation. Many of them are paid fabulous salaries. One such lobbyist is reputed to receive $75,000 a year. It is not unusual for ex-Congressmen and ex-Senators to act in this capacity. Ex-Senator Lenroot of Wisconsin was paid $10,000 to appear before a committee of the United States Senate against the so-called Walsh resolution providing for an investigation of the "power trust." The more influential of these lobbyists have organized themselves into a Monday Lunch Club, which in recent years has come to play a part in the government almost as important as the White House breakfasts.

But direct pressure on legislators through committee hearings, personal interviews, and "sociables" is only a

"part of the game." Equally important is the work of arousing the "folks back home" to write letters, telegrams, and memorials to their representatives demanding that they vote in a particular way. One Anti-Saloon League official boasted in 1917 that he had personally seen to the sending of nine hundred telegrams to Congressmen in a single day. A recent letter from the New York League to Abolish Capital Punishment says in part:

> The bill to abolish capital punishment in New York state through an amendment to the Penal Code is now before the New York state legislature. . . .
>
> Will you not write to the chairman of the Codes Committees *as soon as possible* telling them that you favor the abolition of the death penalty, with your reasons for this belief? Please demand a test vote in the 1928 legislature.
>
> Can you get at least ten more men and women to write such letters.

Enclosed with the above was a letter to serve as a sample. Pressed for time, the citizen had merely to copy this and send it on, although as a rule representatives are suspicious of form letters.

The following letter sent to the employees of the Great Western Sugar Company, at Longmont, Colorado, May 12, 1913, speaks for itself:

> You have heard so much of the tariff bill and its probable effect on our industry that many of you think, no doubt, that it is only a scare and that the Sugar Company will not be hurt by it. . . .
>
> If the bill, as it has been passed by the House of Representatives, should be passed by the United States Senate . . . not more than two or three of our nine factories could be operated, and you all know also that idle factories mean idle men.
>
> As employees of the company, interested in keeping the fac-

tories in operation, will you not each one write a letter to the Hon. Charles S. Thomas, United States Senate, and the Hon. John F. Shafroth, United States Senate, Washington, D. C., asking that they use their influence to have the "Free-Sugar-in-Three-Years" clause eliminated in the tariff bill?

Your letter will have just as much influence with those gentlemen as any letter they will receive, and we would ask that you show your interest in the state at large as well as the company you are working for by doing this, *advising the head of your department when you have written this letter.* If you are a Democrat and will so state in your letter, it will carry even more weight. . . .

Very truly yours,

N. R. McCREARY, MANAGER

[Italics are McCreary's.]

The lobbyist keeps an eagle eye upon the politicians. He knows their habits and their hopes, their mistakes, their weaknesses, their debts, all the skeletons in their closets, both public and private.

Speaking of the lobbyist for the American Farm Bureau Federation, Frank Kent says:

> The power he has is an enormous one, and the pressure he can bring upon Senators and Representatives from the "folks back home" . . . is almost irresistible. When the "word" goes out from Washington, the farmers from the 7,500 organizations respond as a man, and thousands upon thousands of telegrams from constituents who count — men of substance and standing — pour into Washington. There are not many statesmen who can stand up against such pressure.

An Anti-Saloon League official in Pennsylvania boasted in 1908: "I can dictate twenty letters to twenty men . . . and thereby set fifty thousand men in action . . . especially for temperance propaganda. . . . Governor Brumbaugh, a few

months ago, said that no politician or political party could afford to turn a deaf ear to the demands of such an organized body of men." The ordinary politician is more afraid of his constituents when thus aroused than he is of the hounds of Hades.

Summing up an experience of twenty years as agent of temperance groups, Mr. S. E. Nicholson wrote in 1919:

> The choosing of issues, the determination of policies, the introduction of bills, are not half the battle. Watching bills after introduction, lobbying before committees and among Congressmen, arranging for hearings in behalf of measures presented, are all a vital part of a national legislative program. Yet even these . . . are mere incidents in the campaign. Back of all such endeavor there must be a nation-wide movement of public opinion, voicing itself in a way that will be heard by every Congressman. Petitions are important, if presented in sufficient volume; personal communications to members are still more effective, personal interviews are best of all, where the citizen can come face to face with his member and, out of the fullness of his heart, make known his wishes for legislation as a true American sovereign.

Not only are legislators flooded with letters and petitions, but trips to the national and state capitals are organized so that the voters can meet their representatives face to face. During the debates in Congress on prohibition the "dry" forces packed the galleries with prohibitionists as an "object lesson" to the legislators. Bartholdt of Missouri suggested that the House move out of Washington to avoid pressure from the drys. Speaking to the galleries he said: "Never mind! You may intimidate village councils and members of state legislatures and even some Congressmen, but you cannot cow or intimidate me." He came from a

safe wet district and could defy the League. In one hearing on a local option bill in Maryland it required two trains of twenty-two cars to carry the drys to Annapolis. The room was so swamped with them that some members of the committee had difficulty getting in.*

The pressure which these groups are able to exert depends in final analysis upon the efficiency of their propaganda. To the average person this word has a sinister meaning. Many use it as synonymous with downright lying and deception, and even its more moderate critics regard it as "the dissemination of half truths for an ulterior purpose." In its broadest meaning, propaganda is nothing but the advocacy of an attitude. Every person who has an opinion or an attitude which he endeavors to have others share is a propagandist. The greatest propaganda force in the modern world is probably the Christian religion, as exemplified by its missionaries.

We cannot describe here the propaganda of all these associations and groups. All seek to secure public approval for their policies and all employ the familiar instruments of publicity. They issue bulletins to their own members, to the general public, and to the Press. They advertise, use the radio, moving pictures, and magazines, organize mass meetings, and employ brass bands. They maintain headquarters in Washington, not only because the government is there but because Washington is the sounding board of the nation.

* The American Bankers' League, the American Taxpayers' League, and the Council of State Legislatures paid the expenses of 150 delegates who descended upon the Ways and Means Committee in 1927 to urge the repeal of the Federal estate tax.

During the hearings on the Fordney McCumber tariff the corridors leading to the Finance Committee were "so filled with lobbyists that it was almost impossible for an outside Senator to get to the committee room."

The following illustrations are indicative of the nature and scope of their activities.

During the period from 1909 to 1923 the Anti-Saloon League printed and circulated over 157,000,000 copies of temperance papers. It flooded the country with a total of 2,000,000 books, over 5,000,000, pamphlets, 114,000,000 leaflets, 2,000,000 window cards, and over 18,000,000 other cards, stickers, etc. Every known argument was used to convince people that the saloon was the devil's workshop and liquor his hellish brew. One pamphlet described the saloon as follows:

> The saloon is the storm center of crime; the devil's headquarters on earth; the schoolmaster of a broken decalogue; the defiler of youth; the enemy of the home; the foe of peace; the deceiver of nations; the beast of sensuality; the past master of intrigue; the vagabond of poverty; the social vulture; the rendezvous of demagogues; the enlisting office of sin; the serpent of Eden; a ponderous second edition of hell, revised, enlarged, and illuminated.

The worker was told that liquor was a greater enemy to him than low wages; capitalists were told that liquor was the archenemy of efficiency. School children were taught the evils of drink in so-called temperance physiology textbooks. By 1906 every state in the Union required such teaching in the public schools. During the war the brewers and liquor dealers were accused of pro-Germanism and treason. Songs and poems by the hundreds were recited and sung in every church with a religious fervor that brooked no rejoinder. Following is one of the many poems:

> If you knew the dreadful story of that sparkling cup you're draining,
> How it drags a man from virtue down to dark perdition's brink,

Yes, and wrecks his brain and body, leaves no trace of good remaining —
You would never dare to touch a drop of the Accursed Drink.

So effectively did the League and other temperance organizations make a moral monster of the saloon that today even among the wets not a word is to be heard in its defense.

Today numerous wet organizations are spending hundreds of thousands of dollars in an effort to convince the public that prohibition was a mistake. The evil plight of the farmer is attributed to the loss of a market for his hops and barley. The numerous so-called crime waves are attributed to prohibition. The traditional American disrespect for law, the "revolt of youth," the breakdown of religion and morality, drunkenness, and debauchery are all due, according to the wets, to the "monstrous eighteenth amendment." A prominent wet member of Congress once told the writer the principle upon which the wets base their propaganda. He said in substance:

The wets today are doing exactly what the drys did before prohibition. In the old days every time a crime was committed, every time a girl or boy "went wrong," the prohibitionists with one acclaim cited liquor as the cause. Liquor became associated in the public mind with poverty, vice, crime, and corruption. Now, the wets are merely applying Anti-Saloon League technique. Every time a crime is committed they cry prohibition. Every time a girl or boy goes wrong they shout prohibition. Every time a policeman or a politician is accused of corruption they scream prohibition. As a result they are gradually building up in the public mind the impression that prohibition is a major cause of all the sins in society.

The Association against the Prohibition Amendment, the most powerful of the wet groups, sends out "news" and

other "information" showing the evils of prohibition. In its most recent report the Association says that newspapers "throughout the country, aggregating a combined circulation of 200,000,000," have used its material.

The public utilities, in addition to their propaganda in the schools and the Press, employ numerous other methods. In one year more than ten thousand addresses were delivered by utility speakers to a million and a half people. The sort of material given in these talks may be illustrated by a few quotations from the *Speaker's Handbook*:

> Private ownership is better than municipal or any other form of government ownership because it works better. The statement is as axiomatically true as it is to say that a government of law is better than a state of anarchy.

> Government ownership spells stagnation. . . . Municipal ownership has failed in the United States wherever it has been tried long enough to permit its inherent seeds of failure to sprout and grow. . . . Government ownership tends to build an oligarchy of governmental employees, with the public interest sadly subordinated to personal interest in the payroll. . . . Government ownership proposals (in the United States) are in most instances immoral.

There are speeches to show that utilities are being effectively regulated and that "the interest of the public and of the utility operator and investor in the rate is identical." The speakers are also told to emphasize the fact that some two or three million persons own stock in power companies, for this "offers a compelling reply to government ownership agitators because it embodies the most practical form of true public ownership." The power interests are extremely ingenious. The following is from a letter written by A. F.

Hackenbeamer, president of the Pacific Gas and Electric Company, to A. W. Robertson, of Pittsburgh:

> We discovered the country banker quite a number of years ago. . . . We came to the conclusion . . . that as a practical incentive to get them to work with us there is no substitute for deposits. . . . We have at this time accounts with 230 country banks scattered all over our territory. . . . We believe it is well worth while . . . because it cements their friendship and coöperation. Incidentally, we require no interest on these deposits. . . . We have had occasion to test their friendliness on a number of occasions and they have never failed us. During our two big campaigns against the so-called Water and Power Act (in California) they literally sent out hundreds of thousands of personal letters and pieces of literature to their depositors and stockholders, as well as campaigning against the Act personally. My impression is that the other power companies in California follow pretty much the same policies.

One utility official testified that they had used every known form of publicity except sky-writing.

On the other side are the propagandists for public ownership. The Boulder Dam Association, the National Popular Government League, and the Public Ownership League of America are the most prominent. The literature of these associations depicts the efficiency of publicly owned power plants in the United States and Canada, points to the enormous profits made by the power magnates, and exposes the propaganda of the utilities. In a recent report of the Public Ownership League of America we find:

> For ten years the Public Ownership League of America has been publishing a monthly magazine. . . . Over two thousand municipalities are now on the League's mailing list. . . . Every member of the United States Senate and many members of the House receive our monthly magazine regularly. . . . The

League has just published its forty-first bulletin. . . . These forty-one bulletins have been widely circulated throughout the country — the Public Ownership League has been actively engaged in every state in the Union arousing the people. . . . Two radio stations are now broadcasting the League's message every week. . . . A Press service is prepared and an ever increasing number of daily, weekly, and monthly publications are using this and other publicity matter prepared by us. . . . The Hearst papers have frequently used special articles on the editorial pages of their entire system. . . . Labor papers have used our material freely, in some cases running a series of illustrated articles. . . . The secretary of the League has traveled, lectured, and campaigned in every state in the Union except two.

These latter associations are severely handicapped by lack of funds, and in fighting the "power trust" their struggle resembles the conflict of David against Goliath. They do not have $28,000,000 a year to spend in advertising, as do the utilities, to "grease the rails" of newspapers and thus get friendly treatment, and they have no "guardian angels." *

Some thirty-six patriotic societies carry on active propaganda against "radicalism" and in favor of patriotism and national defense. They circulate "black lists" of liberals, including such people as the presidents of Vassar, Mount Holyoke, and Smith colleges, editors like Oswald Garrison Villard and William Allen White, professors and teachers such as John Dewey, Irving Fisher, and Dean Pound. Of course they include Senators La Follette, Borah, and Norris. All are part of the "red menace." The Daughters of the American Revolution, for instance, recently declared: "The

* The publicity office of General Sugars Inc., under the name of the "All States News Bureau," sends "releases" to 700 newspapers and 1,800 editorial writers throughout the country. The National City Company of New York, which owns all the stock of General Sugars, sends a bulletin advocating lower sugar duties to 300,000 depositors and others.

plan for destructive revolution in the United States by "red" internationalists is not a myth but a proven fact. . . . "[Therefore] *Resolved*: That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, . . . recommend a definite campaign to be organized in every state, to combat this danger."

All pacifist or "liberal" agitation is, according to the National Security League, part of this diabolical conspiracy inspired by "Lenine and Trotzky . . . the two greatest criminal demagogues God ever permitted to walk the earth." According to a recent letter to the writer from the executive secretary of the National Security League, that organization has a corps of three hundred volunteer speakers in all the states campaigning against these "subversive" movements, and in favor of national defense.

Mr. Fred R. Marvin, of the *Key Men of America*, prepares a data sheet describing the activities of the "reds." He is always on the lookout for "evidence." In a letter to Mr. E. C. Shields, of the Associated Industries of Billings, Montana, on February 15, 1924, he says:

My dear Mr. Shields:

How goes the game? I have not had time to write you since Heck was a pup, as the work down here has been exceptionally heavy.

Now I am writing only because I want a little dope. I want the "low down" on one Thomas Walsh, Senator from your state. To what extent has he been mixed with Bill Dunn and the radical element? What is his political life, so far as connections with the radicals are concerned? If you have anything along that line, shoot it to me, please, and I will be your everlasting friend.

His dislike of Senator Walsh is apparently due to the part

which the Montana Senator played in exposing the oil frauds. For, according to Mr. Marvin,

> Calm, cool, reliable, and trustworthy evidence brought out in court . . . proved these leases and contracts, instead of being a part of a scheme to rob the government, were but part of a preparedness program approved by the Naval War board. . . .

For the Constitution of the United States these people have an almost reverential awe.

> The Constitution: there it towers,
> A beacon in a storm-tossed world;
> And peace will reign with all the Powers
> When they like banners have unfurled.
>
> To us belongs the pious task
> To ward from it its gathering foes,
> Both those who lurk 'neath friendship's mask
> And those who deal it hostile blows.

In their campaign against socialism they have the coöperation of many big business organizations. The public utility interests have from time to time circulated their literature. Typical of their point of view is the following:

LAY OF THE SOCIALIST

> When capitalism's been shattered
> And smashed to the very last root,
> When all the banks have been plundered
> And everyone's shared in the loot,
> We shall pause, though a trifle belated —
> And say with a sad hungry sob:
> "We've done with the old rotten system —
> Now I wonder who'll give us a job."
>
> And those who were slobs shall be bosses,
> They shall sit in the master's chair,

Although they'll have nothing for breakfast
And nothing whatever to wear;
They will wander at will through the mansions
Where tyrants once thronged in the hall;
They will ring to have dinner at seven,
But no one will answer the call.

And only the people will suffer,
And only the people will weep,
And no one shall work for money,
And no one shall sow or reap;
But each in his corner shall shiver
And think how much better they fare
With the system of all-having-nothing
Than of some-having-more-than-their-share.

There is a not unwarranted suspicion in the minds of many that these groups suffer from a bad case of persecution mania.

Manufacturers and the Metal Trades Association actively campaign against trade unions, whereas the American Federation of Labor is as earnestly engaged in promoting unionism. Chambers of Commerce propagandize against child-labor legislation, old-age pensions, and compulsory health insurance, while the National League of Women Voters ardently advocates these very things. Civic organizations, many of them mere appendages of selfish interests, bombard the public with propaganda.

"In the midst of so much clamor for his attention," says Charles Beard, "it is not surprising that the citizen is sometimes bewildered and unable to form sound judgments."

Most of these groups take an active part in politics. They besiege party conventions with their demands, exact pledges from candidates, and give their support to those of either

party who agree to support their interests. An amusing illustration of methods employed by the "power trust" was uncovered by the Federal Trade Commission. One utilities' representative in Illinois was asked what kind of material he would use in fighting a Senator who favored government ownership. He replied that he would "pin the Bolshevik idea onto such a candidate. Logic and reason can only be used to a hand-picked audience." The Anti-Saloon League ties the tin can of the saloon to the tail of every wet candidate, and the liberal and radical groups see in every conservative a "cat's-paw of Wall Street."

It is useless to bewail the activities of these associations. As Mr. Herring says, they "represent a healthy democratic development. They rose in answer to certain needs. . . . They are part of our representative system. . . . There is no turning back. These groups must be welcomed for what they are, . . . must be understood, and their place in government allotted, if not by actual legislation, then by general public realization of their significance."

We have commented in a previous chapter upon the activities of Press agents and publicity bureaus. These agents are high-power propagandists. They are "shirt-stuffers" for prominent persons and corporations. The public relations counsel see to it that their clients are kept before the public and always in a favorable light. They can manufacture a reputation almost overnight. "Given proper publicity," says one of them, "a mediocre chorus girl becomes a star, a cheap painting becomes a work of art, a tawdry story of illicit love becomes a sensational novel." A New York art company a few years ago found itself "loaded" with a certain picture which it was unable to sell at any price. The picture was the

famous *September Morn,* showing a naked girl standing ankle deep in water, "modestly trying to hide her nakedness from the eyes of a prying world." The art company employed a publicity man who proceeded as follows:

I had my employers put an enlargement on display in the window of an art shop on West Thirty-first Street. I then went down to Greenwich Village and hired ten boys and girls of various ages and sizes to stand in front of the window. I coached them how to act when anybody stopped to look at *September Morn.*

Finally I called on [Anthony] Comstock, launched upon a bitter denunciation of this immoral display, and insisted that he accompany me so that he could see with his own eyes how it was undermining the morals of the youth of our fair city. . . . Comstock took one look and was horrified. He ordered the picture removed forthwith, but the shop-owners refused to obey. The Anti-Vice Society head appealed to the courts. The newspapers leaped to the story with glee. *September Morn* became famous overnight. Songs were written around it, vaudeville artists joked about it, reform ministers denounced it, and in the next six months four million men and women bought it at one dollar a copy.

Henry F. Pringle, in his *Alfred E. Smith: A Critical Study*, describes the work of Mrs. Henry Moskowitz, Smith's publicity adviser:

To her desk come high state officials, influential politicians, and many others anxious to know how the governor feels about various matters. Almost every Friday night she goes to Albany for long conferences with Smith. . . .

With her invariable calm she tells him of the reaction to some legislative message, informs him of an invitation it would be wise to accept, assures him that she has collected data needed for an important address. To her office also come numerous magazine writers seeking information regarding the governor

and his policies. . . . In some instances she personally writes articles which appear later as the work of others. Infrequent magazine and newspaper articles signed by Smith are usually, but not always, her work. . . .

All great men in public life have some figure such as Mrs. Moskowitz whose task it is to prevent "unfortunate" news stories, to broadcast subtle propaganda, to see that the newspaper correspondents are given correct impressions. They, in a sense, are super-public relations counsel whose first duty is to create and then preserve a legend around their principals.

These public relations counsel act in the double capacity of interpreting their clients to the public and the public to their clients. Whether it be for a chorus girl or a corporation, a politician or a preacher, their methods are essentially the same.*

The past masters of propaganda in the United States are the advertising men. Much can be learned about propaganda technique from a study of their methods. Every year close to two billion dollars is spent to make people "beauty conscious," "grape conscious," "shoe conscious," "garter conscious," until, as one wag expressed it, "they buy these products from their unconscious."

The good advertising man knows his product and his public. He knows that nine-tenths of human behavior is due to habit, that people think as much with their viscera as with their brains. He knows that millions of people live on a daily diet of Arthur Brisbane, that Harold Bell Wright is their favorite author, and that countless thousands hold Gloria

* Edward L. Bernays, one of the foremost publicity men, is widely credited with having organized the famous "Edison Smartest Boy Contest" and the "Edison Jubilee of Light," on behalf of electrical utility interests. Ivy Lee and Associates, Inc., public relations counsel for many prominent men and corporations, received huge fees for carrying on propaganda against the five-cent fare in New York City.

Swanson and Rudolph Valentino as their ideals. He takes account of the fact that to seven hundred thousand Epworth Leaguers the greatest men in history are, in order of rank: Edison, Roosevelt, Shakspere, Longfellow, Tennyson, Hoover, Dickens, Pershing, Lloyd George, and Andrew J. Volstead. He realizes that most people know nothing about current events and care less, that out of a thousand Knoxville high-school students over five hundred could not locate the District of Columbia, that 95 per cent of the senior class did not know what the electoral college is. He knows that in a recent survey of two thousand high-school students throughout the country over 10 per cent could not identify a picture of Calvin Coolidge, and that they thought "Ma" Ferguson was an opera singer, a baseball player, and a movie star. This great public, whose philosophy is the pious platitudes of the late Dr. Frank Crane and whose "greatest" poet is Edgar Guest, who believe that "women cannot be understood" and that all Bolsheviks wear whiskers and carry bombs, are his audience. For, by and large, he makes his appeal to the average man — the man who, according to Professor Hollingworth,

> is 5 feet 7 inches tall and weighs about 150 pounds; [who] will live to be fifty-three and will have married in the twenties and have three to five children; [who] believes that a couple of quinine pills and a stiff drink of whiskey will cure a cold, that the Masonic order goes back to the days of King Solomon, that it is practically fatal to eat lobster and follow it with ice cream, that all Swedes have thick skulls and are stupid, that red-headed people always have quick tempers, that dew falls, that morals were purer twenty years ago, and that the winters were longer and the snow heavier and more frequent when he was a boy.

But the advertising man knows, as must every successful

propagandist, that however "short" the great public is on intellect, it is "long" on "instinct." He knows that underlying all behavior are the primitive urges of hunger, sex, fear, and ambition, that most people desire health and beauty, and that in America financial and social success are uncrowned kings. He studies conversations in subways and sleeping cars, in telephone booths and trade unions, in Rotary clubs and road houses, on Michigan Avenue and Main Street, and learns that most of them are about *people,* not *things,* and that, in order of importance, they discuss people in relation to business, amusement, and sport. He then knows that if he can tie his product to a powerful business man, an actor or actress, a prize fighter or tennis champion, he can build an association which, however unconscious it may be, will ultimately yield results.

"Most people," says Claude C. Hopkins, a veteran advertiser, "are seeking happiness, safety, beauty, and content." It is to these desires that the advertiser appeals. No one, they tell us, can have beauty who is fat — hence, "reach for a Lucky instead of a sweet." Halitosis is a standing menace to business success and social popularity, as indeed are "sloppy socks," hence, "gargle with Listerine," and "wear Paris Garters." If you would "keep that schoolgirl complexion" or have a "skin you love to touch," there is no escaping Palmolive Soap. You can reduce by eating Sunkist Oranges, cure dandruff with Listerine and Wildroot, and assert your manhood by smoking Roi-Tan cigars. Do you suffer from insomnia? "Drink Sanka." Are you a victim of indigestion? "Take Pepto Bismol." Is there music in your soul craving expression? Fifteen lessons by correspondence, and you will put Paderewski to shame. No need to lack

vim, vigor, and vitality — for here is the precious gift of yeast. "People who get ahead fastest in business, keep clean in all particulars every day," says the American Association of Soap and Glycerine Producers.

Listen to the instructions of one advertising manager to Mrs. Helen Woodward, when she was asked to write an advertisement for an infant's food: "As for this baby food, for God's sake put some sob-stuff in it. You know, and make it beautiful too. Make it beautiful, make the words sing. Heavens! There isn't a woman who cares about facts. That kind of stuff you write for the *Woman's Home Companion*, that's what gets 'em. Tears! Make 'em weep!"

So thoroughly have the advertisers applied the basic principles of human behavior in their "copy" that Theodore McManus was led to say in a recent issue of *Printer's Ink*:

> Much present-day advertising . . . ascribes to [its products] practically all the felicities of life.
>
> The cigarette has almost become a health food — certainly a weight reducer. The humble cake of soap has risen far above its modest mission of cleansing, and confers the precious boon of beauty. . . .
>
> The motor car is the sign manual of social election. It is an engine of business efficiency. It is a mechanical miracle; its creator, a demigod. It and he are so many great things that it requires an expenditure of nearly $100,000,000 a year simply to catalogue them.
>
> Beauty, health, learning, and success are no longer the hard-won rewards of virtue, character, and education and endeavor. They can be bought in the first drug store or bookshop. . . .
>
> We are all glowing and sparkling and snapping and tingling with health, by way of the toothbrush, and the razor, and the shaving cream, and the face lotion, and the deodorant, and a dozen other brightly packaged gifts of the gods. Sometimes we

can even extract an almost dangerous vigor and virility of sex from the same precious packages.

Lament this if you will, but it is effective. Even automobile manufacturers are putting "sex appeal" into their ads, and present-day hosiery and underwear advertising should cause old Anthony Comstock to turn in his grave. Why do you suppose people buy such a plebeian product as house paint! For utility? Certainly not. The paint and varnish advertising sales managers in a recent conference proposed to give up their slogan "Save the surface and you save all," because few people buy paint for its preservative qualities. It is only "when their pride suffers upon comparison of their homes with the homes of their neighbors [that] they are likely prospective buyers of paint." Whether the paint peels or the wood rots is a small matter, but we must "keep up with the Joneses."

We have been so drilled in stereotypes and slogans that to 800 college students out of a thousand tested, cameras meant "Eastman"; to 771, sewing machines meant "Singer"; to 757, soup meant none other than "Campbell's." Fountain pens mean "Waterman"; razors, "Gillette"; soap, "Ivory"; and revolver, "Colt." Try a few slogans on yourself: What do the following signify?

Ask the man who owns one
Candy mint with the hole
Chases dirt
A clean tooth never decays
The flavor lasts
From contented cows
Hasn't scratched yet
It's toasted
No metal can touch you
The skin you love to touch
There's a reason
Time to re-tire
His master's voice
Keep that schoolgirl complexion
Good to the last drop
It floats

Advertisers have made psychology a working science.

John B. Watson is paid handsomely by one of the country's largest advertising agencies to apply the principles of the conditioned response to Quaker Oats and Cold Cream.

Cigarette manufacturers have raised their lowly product from the slough into which it has been kicked by the ugly term "coffin nail" and have placed it on a pinnacle where statesmen and ship captains, athletes and actors, chorus girls and kings, do not hesitate to endorse it. Sixty million dollars a year it is costing, but in 1928 the American people consumed over 105,000,000,000 cigarettes. In fact, so successful have they been that Senator Smoot is out to smite them with the mighty lash of legislation. In introducing a bill to censor tobacco advertising, Smoot declared:

> I rise to denounce insidious cigarette campaigns now being promoted by those tobacco manufacturing interests whose only god is profit, whose only bible is the balance sheet, whose only principle is greed. I rise to denounce the unconscionable, heartless, and destructive attempts to exploit the women and youth of our country in the interests of a few powerful tobacco organizations whose rapacity knows no bounds.

Cigarette manufacturers are making addicts of adolescents and imperiling the Republic.

There are protests from others. The Federal Trade Commission threatens to make war on dishonest ads. The Better Business Bureau has denounced the "tainted testimonial," and preachers weekly inveigh against the immoral pictures which accompany advertisements for bathing suits and bath towels. But the copy writers, like pied pipers of perdition, go merrily on.

Let a word be said for the advertiser. He has taught us how to make opinion as well as to sell goods. He has made mass production permanently possible by creating mass

demand. According to a recent writer in the *New Republic*, the advertiser is striking at the corner stone of capitalism by emphasizing *service* and *use* rather than *ownership*. His technique is being applied to the crusade against crime. "You can't win" may be seen in every street car and subway. "Repetition" may bring "reputation" for obedience to law as for B.V.D.'s. Even the churches advertise, and many of them in most flamboyant style. Perhaps the day is not distant when advertisers will make international peace a reality rather than a twentieth-century refuge for scoundrels. When the United States Senate ratified the Kellogg Peace Treaty, Bruce Barton, the advertiser, wrote to *Printers' Ink*:

> The treaty now lies securely in the vault. It has seen the front page or indeed any page of the newspapers for the last time.
>
> Why was there no ringing of bells? No parades? No holidays declared by banks and businesses? Why no mighty paean of gratitude from the mothers of the world because of this step toward peace? . . . Because nobody knows what is in the treaty. Nobody will ever know. A year hence not one man in ten will be able to remember its name. . . .
>
> Yet this Kellogg Treaty might have been made a great success by the addition of a couple of paragraphs: . . .
>
> *Resolved*: That each of the nations signing this treaty shall discontinue the building of one battleship, and shall devote the cost of said battleship to a continuous advertising campaign, which shall explain and reëxplain this treaty, reminding its people of their obligations under it, and seeking in every possible way to cultivate a sense of international responsibility and good will.

Mr. Barton goes on to say: "I am informed that the cost of a really bang-up battleship in these piping days of peace is around $35,000,000. If the advertising fraternity of the United States were entrusted with $2,000,000 for seventeen

years we could make the Kellogg Treaty mean something in the consciousness of the American people." It is possible.

Those of us who lived through the recent war are painfully aware of the power of propaganda to make us hate. Professors, preachers, everyone who could speak, sing, or write, was mobilized in the great cause of preserving our morale by destroying the last vestige of our intellectual morality. Said Professor Vernon Kellogg, of Stanford University, speaking of the Germans:

> Hence will it be any wonder if after the war the people of the world, when they recognize any human being as a German, will shrink aside so that they may not touch him as he passes, or stoop for stones to drive him from their path?

Or listen to the Reverend Newell Dwight Hillis, of Brooklyn, he who wrote the "canned" sermons for a hundred thousand preachers:

> Society has organized itself against the rattlesnake and the yellow fever. . . . The boards of health are planning to wipe out typhoid and the black plague. Not otherwise, lovers of their fellow men have finally become perfectly hopeless with reference to the German people. They have no more relation to the civilization of 1918 than an orang-outang, a gorilla, a Judas, a hyena, a thumbscrew, or a scalping knife in the hands of a savage. These brutes must be cast out of society.

He then declared that a body of scientists were soon to meet to consider the sterilization of ten million German soldiers and the segregation of their women.

Then too, there was "Billy" Sunday. Before the House of Representatives he prayed:

> Thou knowest, O Lord, that no nation so infamous, vile, greedy, sensuous, bloodthirsty, ever disgraced the pages of history.

Make bare Thy mighty arm, O Lord, and smite the hungry, wolfish Hun, whose fangs drip with blood, and we will forever raise our voices in Thy praise.

And the House, for the first time in history, applauded a prayer.

Truth was crucified during the war. We shall not attempt to probe her wounds here, but merely cite two books, Harold Laswell's *Propaganda Technique in the World War* and Arthur Ponsonby's *Falsehood in War Time.**

Propaganda in itself is not bad. It never tells the whole truth, but who knows the whole truth to tell? It can be an instrument for great good. There may come a time when those who love their fellows will have the means and the will to propagandize for peace with the same enthusiasm and efficiency that bigots and brutes now spread their doctrines of hate. Our average man loves to believe that he thinks for himself. If those who manipulate his mind were really Christians the kingdom would be at hand.

* The extent and nature of American war propaganda has been ably summarized by C. H. Hamlin in his little book on *The War Myth in United States History*: "After the United States entered the war in April, 1917, we immediately created a government propaganda bureau, which was known as 'The Committee on Public Information,' with George Creel as chairman. . . . No effort was made to present the truth. Allied propaganda was accepted and to it we added ours. This 'Committee on Public Information' issued 75,099,023 pamphlets and books to encourage the public 'morale.' They hired the services of 75,000 speakers. . . . Altogether, about 755,190 speeches were made by these people. . . . Exhibits were given at fairs, and war films were prepared for the cinema. . . . A total of 1,438 drawings were employed to arouse popular hatred. An official daily newspaper was issued which had a circulation of 100,000 copies. A propaganda bureau was established by the United States, in the capitals of every nation in the world except those of the Central Powers. The total expenditure for propaganda by the United States was $6,738,223. This was the greatest fraud ever sold to the public in the name of patriotism and religion." See also *How We Advertised America*, by George Creel.

Chapter VIII

THE ARTS AND THE AUDIENCE

1. Motion Pictures

No more potent influence on opinion could be devised than the motion picture. Eighty-seven per cent of our ideas come from visual impressions. When Thomas Nast was flaying the Tweed Ring in his *Harper's Weekly* cartoons, Tweed is supposed to have offered him $500,000 to "lay off," saying: "Let's stop them d—d pictures. I don't care so much what the papers write about me — my constituents can't read — but d—n it, they can see the pictures." "Seeing is believing," "Actions speak louder than words," say the old saws, and the movies deal in actions that can be seen. Countless thousands live and have their being after the manner of Mary Pickford, Rudolph Valentino, Douglas Fairbanks, and Gloria Swanson.

The movies bid fair to exert a more profound influence on human behavior than the printing press. "For," says Bernard Shaw, "the number of people who can read is small, the number of these who can read to any purpose much smaller, and the number of those who are too tired after a hard day's work to read . . . enormous. But all except the blind and deaf can see and hear."

The motion picture industry ranks fourth in size in the United States. It represents an investment of some two

billions of dollars and involves annual expenditures of $134,000,000, exclusive of advertising and publicity. It employs more people than Ford and General Motors combined. There are in the neighborhood of 20,000 picture "palaces," with a weekly attendance of close to 100,000,000.

Clayton Hamilton, writing in the New York *Evening Post* of December 30, 1922, said: "I care not who makes the laws of the nation if I may decide what is to be shown upon its motion picture screens."

It is pertinent to ask at this point what fare those who control this amusement octopus offer. First of all, it should be borne in mind that the cost of manufacturing pictures is tremendous: the average picture involves an outlay of some $200,000 and it is not unusual for the cost to run well over a million. To make such a business pay, it is necessary to appeal to the widest possible public. From a business point of view the box office tells the tale. Says a well-known scenario writer:

> That motion pictures appeal to everybody means, in terms of business, that each picture should be made to obtain the patronage of everybody everywhere. This means, in turn, that every film must be intelligible to everybody; and in order to be that, *it must meet the level of intelligence of every audience which is to see it. The lowest intellectual level, consequently, is that which governs the character of the appeal to be made.* [Italics mine.]

The producer must strike, as nearly as possible, the least common denominator of emotion and intelligence. He knows that people everywhere respond to appeals of hunger, sex, and ambition. Most men secretly yearn to be Don Juans and John D.'s, most women long to be composites of Mary

Magdalene and the Madonna. The movies provide an emotional outlet for these desires. In the semi-dark of the picture house the "misunderstood husband," the exploited and exhausted worker, the drudge wife, can enter into the romances of the screen. They can commit adultery by proxy, engage in the most thrilling adventures, become Cinderellas or Caesars, and for the time being forget, as utterly as in the dream world, the harsh and dull realities of the workaday world.

A hasty examination of the films offered during a single year reveals that they fall naturally into several categories. There are "ultra-modern society dramas," "western melodramas," "western comedy-dramas," "romantic dramas," "crook dramas," "domestic dramas revolving around the triangle," "comedies based on romance," "mystery comedy-dramas," "heart interest dramas," "society comedies," and, on rare occasions, "picture pageants."

Turning to a recent issue of the *Motion Picture News*, we may cite a few titles just as they come: *The Arizona Whirlwind, The Beloved Rogue, Birds of Prey, Cabaret, Flaming Youth, Fashions for Women, Heaven on Earth, Is That Nice? Love Makes 'Em Wild, Molders of Men, The Night Bride, The Notorious Lady, Orchids and Ermine, The Price of Honor, Riders of the West, The Sensation Seekers, The Telephone Girl, The Venus of Venice*, and *What Every Girl Should Know.*

The movies are obsessed with sex, sentiment, and success. Stories of illicit love appeal to the tradition-tied, morally manacled husband who hankers for forbidden fruit. Stories of mother love, patriotism, and pathos arouse primitive social emotions in us all. Tales of poor boys and girls who,

through acumen and accident, became rich and powerful, strike familiar chords in the crowd. A movie producer once said that a perfect scenario must have five things: "religion, humor, society, action, and sex." An enterprising writer thereupon submitted the following as a perfect scenario: " 'My God!' laughed the Duchess, 'let go my leg.' "

Stories written especially for the screen are, with the exception of slapstick, rare. Novels, short stories, and plays which have already proved popular with the public, form the basis for over three-fourths of the motion pictures. But unless the play or story is well known, a "best seller," it is likely to undergo considerable change in the hands of the producer. Thus, *La Gioconda* becomes *The Devil's Daughter; La Tosca* becomes *The Song of Hate; Jewels of the Madonna* becomes *Sin*; Barrie's *Admirable Crichton* becomes *Male and Female*; Clyde Fitch's *The Bachelor* becomes *The Virtuous Vamp*; Tolstoy's *Anna Karenina* is baptized *Love*; Melville's *Moby Dick* becomes *The Sea Beast*; Conrad's *Victory* becomes, first, *Flesh of Eve*, and later, *Dangerous Paradise*.

The movies pander to the panics and pruriency of the herd. *The Birth of a Nation*, produced by D. W. Griffith, a Kentuckian, voiced the age-old prejudice of the white against the Negro. It might well serve as an official apology for the Ku Klux Klan, and many believe it to have been partly responsible for the Klan's revival. Incidentally, it was not popular among Negroes. Prior to the war *The Battle Cry of Peace* did much to make Americans believe in preparedness, and during the war *The Beast of Berlin* and *To Hell with the Kaiser* did their bit in sowing seeds of hatred. The Russians have come to realize the propaganda power of

the movies. Such pictures as *Ten Days That Shook the World, Potemkin, The End of St. Petersburg,* and *The Soviet Union at Work,* apart from their exceptionally fine artistic qualities, must, if given wide circulation, have a telling effect upon our attitudes toward the Soviets. The patriotic Key Men of America are alert to the danger of these Russian films. The *Data Sheet* of May 15, 1929, has this to say: "In the campaign to 'put over' the recognition of Soviet Russia, members of the Third (Communist) International in the United States, engaged in that particular line of work, have found the theater, especially the motion picture, one of the best systems."

The commercial movies, on the whole, fight shy of obvious propaganda. Unless the "message" can be woven into a sugary story or a rattling adventure, there is every likelihood that it will offend "paying customers." But subtle associations constantly repeated may have a telling effect. How many films have for their hero an obvious member of the Nordic race, and in how many is the villain a dark and devious Latin? Laborers on the screen are usually depicted as ignorant and offensive, or else obsequiously obedient to the sparkling sons and daughters of the rich. Open propaganda is less apparent. Out of 840 films examined a few years ago, only fifteen, or about 1.7 per cent, were classified as propagandist, that is to say, were obviously Anti-German, Pro-Christian Science, Anti-venereal, Armenian Relief, Salvation Army, Pro-Food Conservation, and Political.* On the other hand, it is deemed safe to portray the Bolsheviks and "radicals" as undesirable. Most American-made

* See H. A. Larrabee, "The Formation of Public Opinion through Motion Pictures, "*Religious Education,* XV (1920), 144 ff.

pictures of the Russian revolution have as heroes handsome aristocrats of the old régime; whereas the villains are usually ignorant and brutal Bolsheviks. It is also safe to portray the power of prayer, as in the *Miracle Man* and the *Ten Commandments*. America is a Christian country, and the *King of Kings* can offend only the atheists and anarchists, who scarcely count anyway. But to include anything which may give offense to powerful groups, such as the Irish, Catholics, Methodists, Patriots, or Prohibitionists, is bad business; and the producers rarely run the risk. For example, the International Federation of Catholic Alumnae claim that countless deletions of scenes objectionable to Catholics have been made under pressure from them.

On current controversial questions the movies keep to the middle of the road. The *Milwaukee Journal* for January 25, 1922, said that Will Hays, czar of the movies, was to transform them into a vehicle for Republican propaganda, but there is little evidence to support the charge. The primary political concern of the movie magnates is their fight against censorship, and in this they use the customary tactics of other pressure groups. Rarely do they use the screen directly. In November, 1922, however, three measures were submitted to the voters of Massachusetts, one of which was a movie censorship bill. Practically all the movie screens in the state were used to tell the people to "Vote *No* on the Amendments," and all the proposed laws were defeated. There is perhaps some connection between this campaign against censorship and the unfavorable light in which reformers are pictured. Here, however, they must tread lightly, for they dare not picture the clergy as being either malevolent or ridiculous. In the very excellent picture,

Sadie Thompson, featuring Gloria Swanson, the villain of the piece, who, in the play, was a religious missionary, takes on the vague character of a "reformer."

The news reels may be effective instruments for propaganda. The constant showing of naval and military maneuvers helps to keep us "defense conscious." It may be merely a coincidence that Will Hays and many movie magnates have been sworn in as officers of the United States Army Signal Corps' motion picture council. Prominent politicians, who in the ordinary course of things cannot appear personally to more than a small fraction of the people, can, through the movies, be brought face to face with millions. A prominent Republican, speaking of President Harding, once said to Ray Hall, editor of *Fox News Reels*:

> There never has been a President for whom the people have such affection. It is because they felt a personal acquaintance with him. For that, more than anything else, motion pictures, and particularly motion picture news reels, are responsible.

An arresting illustration of the manner in which the news reels are censored to meet the public taste is related by Mr. Hall. When Lenin died, news pictures reviewing his life were collected and sent along with regular editions to exhibitors. Mr. Hall and S. L. Rothafel (Roxy) were viewing them before their presentation in the latter's theater. "Great pictures," said Roxy, "wonderful and interesting, but I wouldn't show them in my theater for ten thousand dollars. . . . In a cosmopolitan city like New York, there are all sorts of people. Undoubtedly, there are sympathizers with Lenin. If I showed the picture, they might applaud. Then someone might hiss. Instantly everyone in the house is uncomfortable. It might develop into real un-

pleasantness; someone might have to be evicted. Anyway, it would be sure to engender controversy. And in any theater that I manage we will do everything to avoid controversy."

Do the ever recurrent bathing beauties and baby parades help to explain the vogues in figures and families?

The influence of the movies upon current standards of living is prodigious. The styles of Manhattan and Hollywood become those of Main Street and Hogg Hollow, in furniture, automobiles, hairdressing, and architecture. Will Hays, speaking to the Detroit Chamber of Commerce on June 5, 1928, said:

> Gentlemen, motion pictures today are your selling agency as much as that great acreage of white space on printed pages. . . . We do not sell for you a certain type of car, or a certain make of furniture, or a brand of ginger ale. But by putting before a hundred million theatergoers every week the drama of the possibilities in American life, by showing every American the comforts he can have if he combines work with thrift, we launch a sales impulse that seems to me incalculable. . . . Through the motion picture we are bettering living conditions everywhere — especially in the small towns. No longer does the girl in Sullivan, Indiana, guess as to what the styles are going to be in three months. She knows — because she sees them on the screen. . . . The head of the house sees a new kind of golf suit in the movies and he wants one. The housewife sees a lamp of new design. Perhaps the whole family gets a new idea for redecorating and refurnishing the parlor.

The movie brings to millions of city workers "caught in the grind and the routine of their daily tasks, overwrought by the whirl of business deals, inhibiting the natural play of mind, muscle, and mood . . . visions of financial success, of free, unrestrained joy, of the thrills and dangers of outdoor

adventures." They bring to the city street urchin the charm of the country, show him horses, cows, and chickens, and widen the horizons of his life. To the farm boy they show the comforts and customs of the city, so that he demands bathtubs, motor cars, radios, and fine clothes. China, India, France, England, the South Seas, are brought to his very door. According to Henry Ford, the movies have been instrumental in keeping sufficient man-power on the farms to supply us with the necessities of life. There are others who believe them to be a potent factor in driving farmers to the cities. No one questions their influence.

Special movies have been used to promote "safety first," to instill lessons of health, and to teach history, economics, and geography. The National Board of Review recently prepared a list of 162 pictures "for presentation on patriotic occasions" and in connection with Americanization work. The titles include *The Unknown Soldier, The Big Guns of the Navy, Don't Give Up the Ship* (showing what the navy means to the people), *Lest We Forget, Our Defenders, Gloryifying Old Glory,* and *The Making of an American.* From January to June, 1919, 38,821 men saw "safety" films at the Ford plant, and accidents decreased 27 per cent. *One Scar or Many,* a smallpox film shown to 12,980 children in Gary, Indiana, resulted in more than 1,600 requests for vaccination within a few days. According to Thomas C. Edwards, of the National Health Council, "it is safe to say that the three hundred or more health pictures now in existence, with their thousands of copies, have been shown to 200,000,000 people." The Yale University Press is developing a series of historical pictures. Results indicate that, while they are less effective in conveying ab-

stract ideas, they are extremely influential in giving color to historical events, and in teaching social history they are unexcelled. Compare a literary account of Washington at Valley Forge with a moving picture of those stirring days. Imagine what history would mean could we have had news reels of Xerxes' army crossing the Hellespont, or of Napoleon at Waterloo. Nathaniel Wright Stephenson cites as an illustration of the value of the movies in teaching history the following comments from a young Italian viewing a movie showing the signing of the Declaration of Independence. "The author of the photoplay introduced for strictly historical reasons a social entertainment at Philadelphia while the Declaration was pending. 'Why,' exclaimed the Italian, 'I had no idea they had such good manners in those days.' . . . And when at another point he glimpsed a rough crowd in the street dramatically contrasted with conservative wealth, his comment was, 'So, there was all that difference in classes, was there?' "

The life of primitive peoples can be taught by the movies in a fashion that leaves an indelible impression on the student's mind. *Nanook of the North, Moana of the South Seas*, and that superb picture, *Grass*, are typical of what may be done.

It is estimated that twenty-five thousand churches in America use the screen as an adjunct to the pulpit. Fifteen thousand schools, from kindergarten to college, are now making use of moving pictures. But the educational possibilities of the films have scarcely been tapped. The average movie audience is drowned in a flood of slobbering sex and sentiment. Educational movies in themselves are not commercially profitable, and when they are sandwiched in be-

tween *Abie's Irish Rose* and *Getting Gertie's Garter*, their effect is likely to be dissipated.

The influence of American movies extends far beyond the boundaries of our own country. Almost 90 per cent of the moving pictures of the world are made here, and they go out to Singapore and Zagreb, London and Louvain, Constantinople and Canton. At the gateway to the Garden of Gethsemane, under the shadow of the Sphinx, within a stone's throw of the League of Nations, one can read the posters, *Dancing Mothers, The Loves of Sonya*, and *Forbidden Paradise*. The view of American life which they present is at best a distortion. They carry the impression that America is a land of millionaires and mountebanks, of cowboys and Indians, of cigarette-smoking, cocktail-drinking women, and sleek "stacombed" men. It is a land of divorce and debauchery, bootleggers and brothels. Lust, greediness, infidelity, murder, malevolence, depravity —"the wide world is invited to believe that the Statue of Liberty holds a red light and that the Tenderloin ends where the West begins." Nevertheless, Chinese girls are abandoning pantaloons for short skirts, long hair for boyish bobs. American manners and morals are spreading throughout the world. Peruvians are demanding player pianos and athletic underwear. Yorkshire manufacturers of boots and clothing complain that they have been obliged to alter their plants because the Near East wants vests like Valentino's and step-ins like Clara Bow's. "The news weeklies," says Frank A. Tichenor, of the Eastern Film Corporation, "have done more to introduce American products into the outside world than any other influence." Between 1924 and 1927, American film exports to the Argentine Republic increased

from 14,000,000 to 23,000,000 feet, and Argentina rose from ninth to sixth place as a market for our goods.

Many Europeans resent this invasion. The British government has become so alarmed that a special commission has been appointed to bolster up the British movies. The London *Daily Mail* recently declared: "British ideals and ideas are being obscured throughout the dominions and at home. American ideas which the cinema disseminates . . . instill the gross materialism of an inferior type of American, instead of the high morality upon which British institutions and ideas are founded." A prominent Englishman, former member of Parliament, son of a peer, complained to the writer that the movies were Americanizing London. In July, 1927, the Vatican warned Europe to be on guard against American movies: "We consider dangerous for our civilization the supremacy which the film-producers of Hollywood are gaining over us. Consciously or unconsciously, they are dosing us with a most lethal poison, which may lead to serious consequences." The Australian film censors refused to pass *The Big Parade* because it was "replete with excessive and offensive U. S. propaganda." The long lines of motor trucks loaded with "doughboys" might cause "many an Australian movie-goer to forget that less than one-seventieth of the soldiers killed during the World War were U. S. citizens." According to the London *Post*: "If the United States abolished its diplomatic and consular services, kept its ships in harbor and its tourists at home [but continued to export its movies] . . . its citizens, its problems, its towns and countryside, its roads, motor cars, and counting houses would still be familiar to the uttermost corner of the world."

Lovers of the theater are alarmed at the manner in which the movies are driving the stage into oblivion. The number of so-called legitimate theaters has decreased from more than 1,500 to 500 in ten years, although in New York the number has increased. Whether this is cultural gain or loss, we do not attempt to say. The average run of stage play is not much better than the average run of movie. Following are a few plays offered in the legitimate playhouses of New York during the 1929 season: *Pleasure Bound, Hold Everything, Show Boat, Whoopee, Hello Daddy, Little Accident, Blackbirds, Lady Fingers,* and *Let Us Be Gay.* And if the critics point to such plays as *Cyrano de Bergerac, The Enemy of the People, What Price Glory, Strange Interlude,* and *Porgy,* the devotees of the silver screen might reply with *Grass, Potemkin, The Covered Wagon, The Big Parade, Metropolis,* and *The Cabinet of Dr. Caligari.* Nor can it be argued that the legitimate stage offers a better chance for the serious and high-calibered play. The following table, taken from an article by Kenneth Macgowan in the December, 1928, *Harper's* shows graphically what happens to the "good" plays on Broadway:

	Number Produced	*Number Successes*	*Per Cent Successes*
Plays	156	35	23
Musical Comedies	32	20	63
Revues	14	7	50
Revivals	16	5	31

The phenominal success of *Abie's Irish Rose* does not indicate a markedly higher taste among the general run of patrons of the legitimate theater than among the movie fans.

There is perhaps more opportunity for serious social criticism on the legitimate stage than in the movies, since it may appeal to a more select audience. But in this fact lies the stage's weakness as well as its strength. It is significant that Will Hays has refused to allow the picturization of the play *Spread Eagle*, showing how American oil men foment revolutions and wars.

The influence of the legitimate drama on public opinion might easily be exaggerated. But the zeal with which professional patriots and morality-mongers combat plays which attack or ridicule accepted social stereotypes indicates a belief in the persuasive powers of the stage. Perhaps Hamlet's remark may have a deeper significance, and the play may be the thing to catch not only the conscience of a king but of a nation.

A more serious aspect of the movie menace is the destruction which has been meted out to the Chautauquas. Whereas in 1920 there were ninety-three Chautauqua circuits operating in the United States, there are today scarcely a dozen. It is undoubtedly true, as D. C. Gillette says, that: "In the Chautauqua . . . despite its absurdities, there is probably more honest educational value than in the whole caboodle of sex-soaked moving pictures." Of course the radio has helped in eliminating the Chautauqua.

But the more serious charges against the movie relate to its effects upon morals. By inspiring in young people a desire to live after the manner of movie queens and princes, the movies, it is said, have undermined those virtues of honesty, thrift, hard work, and good morals which are supposed to constitute the backbone of American character. Illicit love, drinking, gambling, and carousing are presented

in a glamorous light which induces the child to imitation. Much of the alleged current immorality is, according to these critics, due to the influence of the movies. It is not unusual to see boys in the streets and on playgrounds playing at bandit and thug, and little girls dressing and acting like the sinuous vamps of the screen. Lashley and Watson, from a study of the influence of sex movies upon several thousand persons, conclude that when shown to mixed audiences "there was a strong tendency toward flippant discussion and innuendo between boys and girls." In Toledo, Ohio, it was estimated that 50 per cent of all cases of juvenile delinquency is traceable to the movies, and this, we are told, is a conservative estimate. E. H. Sutherland in his book on *Criminology* says:

> Picture shows are even more important than literature in presenting copies making vice and crime attractive and determining imagery. Again and again boys caught in delinquencies have made the explanation: "It looked so easy in the movies, and we thought we could get away with it, too." And these stories come from such distant places and in such different connections that one is justified in believing that some of them are true.

P. W. Wilson, an English correspondent, writing in *Current Opinion* of March, 1921, said: "One day my wife and I visited no fewer than three picture houses in New York. There we learned to our delight at least three new kinds of attractive felony." The constant use of firearms in the movies conveys the impression that revolvers and pistols are necessary implements to success and safety. This subtle association of firearms and automobiles has brought the wild and woolly West back to Fifth Avenue. In spite of

these criticisms, Will Hays in a recent statement said: "And above all, perhaps, is our duty to the youth. . . . We accept the challenge in the righteous demand of the American mother, that the entertainment of that youth be worthy of its value as the most potent factor in the country's future." Should this be set down as merely further illustration of the manner in which Mr. Hays lets not his right hand know what his left doeth?

Comparatively little careful study has been made of the precise relation between the movies and crime and immorality. There seems to be a widespread conviction that there is a connection. The British Cinema Commission reported in 1917 that "moving pictures are having a profound influence upon the mental and moral outlook of millions of our young people — an influence the more subtle in that it is subconsciously exercised — and we leave our labors with the deep conviction that no social problem of the day demands more earnest attention." This commission made an effort to learn what appealed to the youngsters. Over six thousand children were studied, and the results show that the boys as a whole favored pictures of adventure, of cowboys and Indians, but that there was less interest in these among boys of better-class homes. The girls were most interested in domestic or fairy stories. The interest of the boys in love stories does not begin until after the ages of fifteen and sixteen; whereas among the girls there was a sharp upward curve of interest in these pictures from the age of eleven. This study revealed that children remembered the thrilling parts of the movies, the moral being lost in the excitement of the chase. Some of them remembered vividly details of pictures seen two years previous to the test. In Toledo,

Ohio, 25,000 children showed the following preferences, by percentages:

Boys

Adventure	*Comic*	*Educational*	*Pathetic (Sentimental)*
63	21	14	2

Girls

25	19	25	31

"A study of the gang boy's movie heroes," says Thrasher, "throws considerable light upon the character of his social world. Douglas Fairbanks, William S. Hart, Eddie Polo, Pearl White, Charles Chaplin, Harold Lloyd, and Buck Jones stand out prominently in the list, but by far the most popular of them all is Tom Mix, who received about three times as many votes as his nearest competitor. Tom Mix is thus described by one of his admirers:

> I like Tom best because he always plays in a picture of western life. It is none of this sissy stuff that most actors play in. . . . Tom gives thrills by catching runaway horses, fighting Mexicans and bandits, and riding under horses holding on with two feet. He jumps from horses into autos and aeroplanes, and leaps from docks onto boats leaving shore. . . . Fighting a gang of Indians or bandits is Tom's favorite sport. Most of the time he gets shot and captured. Other players always seem to have a party of friends come to the rescue.*

It is difficult to assess the influence of such pictures. Whether this is a legitimate craving for adventure on the part of emotionally starved boys or downright incitement to outlawry and crime is not clear. It should be pointed out that 85 per cent of the movie fans are not children but

* A more recent study of the movie preferences of over ten thousand boys and girls in Chicago by Alice Miller Mitchell reveals the following:

adults, albeit of child mentality. It is unquestionably true that the movies may help to give youngsters immoral or criminal ideas, but it is significant that most of those who are thus affected are either of low-grade mentality or come from homes of poverty, deprivation, and dullness. The solution of the problem seems to be far deeper than merely denouncing the movies as instruments of Satan.

TYPES OF MOVIES NAMED BY CHILDREN FOR FIRST CHOICE

In Percentages

Children		Adventure	Comedy	Educational	Historical	Mystery	Romance	Sport	Tragedy	War	Western
Total	10,052	11.8	13.1	2.1	7.3	9.7	10.1	6.7	5.7	3.8	17.0
Boys	6,015	15.3	13.3	2.1	6.6	10.1	3.9	6.6	3.3	5.1	20.4
Delinquent	1,046	14.1	8.9	0.8	3.1	8.4	5.8	3.9	2.7	3.8	36.6
Scout	3,114	16.6	15.4	2.4	6.4	12.0	1.9	5.8	3.0	6.1	16.7
High School	1,153	13.7	13.0	2.8	12.9	8.9	7.0	11.9	5.6	3.8	7.5
Grade School	702	13.7	11.4	1.3	2.0	6.3	4.7	5.3	2.1	5.1	34.0
Girls	4,037	6.5	12.7	2.1	8.4	9.1	19.4	6.9	9.2	1.9	12.0
Delinquent	373	2.9	2.7	1.3	3.5	5.4	35.4	0.3	5.6	0.3	36.2
Scout	719	9.1	21.0	3.2	8.5	14.6	6.9	10.2	10.6	1.5	7.4
High School	2,180	6.1	10.3	2.1	10.6	8.8	22.8	8.0	9.9	2.2	6.5
Grade School	765	7.2	16.5	1.4	4.6	6.8	13.3	3.7	7.7	2.2	20.2

When asked what scenes thrilled them, they replied as follows: Approximately 45 per cent of the boys named "War and Battles, Indian Warfare, Fighting and Duelling" as the greatest thrill producers in the order named. "Love-Making, Kissing, Marrying" do not appeal to boys; only 3.4 per cent admitted getting a thrill from such scenes. These preferences were essentially the same for all classes of boys. Among the girls "Love-Making, Kissing, Marrying" scenes led, with 13.3 per cent admitting a thrill from these. It is significant that 27.1 per cent of the delinquent girls named love scenes as thrillers. Equally significant is the fact that very few of the children were thrilled by scenes of "Murder, Robbery, Shooting, Holdups," the percentages being 2.4 per cent for all boys, 5.5 per cent for delinquent boys, 1.1 per cent for all girls and 2.9 per cent for delinquent girls. Scenes depicting "Mother Love, Success, Fine Clothes, Parties, and Dancing" did not thrill the children as a rule. See Alice Miller Mitchell, *Children and Movies*, Chicago University Press, 1929.

The whole matter is still a moot question. Criminologists are by no means agreed. "In my ten years' experience in dealing with the criminal," says George Kirchwey, former warden of Sing Sing Prison, "I have never heard of an authentic case of any person who committed a crime because of the influence of a motion picture. In so far as motion pictures have any direct effect, they do not encourage crime, they discourage it. In the motion picture the criminal is never triumphant. The films tell the same moral over and over again: 'You can't get away with it! You can't get away with it!' " According to Professor A. T. Poffenberger, of Columbia University, the chief concern should be for the low-grade adolescent, for

> Motion pictures containing scenes vividly portraying defiance of law and crime of all degrees may, by an ending which shows the criminal brought to justice and the victory of right, carry a moral to the intelligent adult; but that which impresses the mind of the *mentally young* and colors their imagination is the excitement and bravado accompanying the criminal act, while the moral goes unheeded.

The whole controversy reminds one of the old argument as to the influence of liquor on crime. It has never been settled whether drink makes people criminals or whether criminals drink or both. Likewise it is impossible to say whether those with criminal tendencies go to the movies or whether the movies instill criminal tendencies in those who attend. The moving pictures may give patterns and methods for criminal acts, as drink may give a temporary and artificial "courage." On the other hand, it is a not unreasonable conjecture that by offering a vicarious outlet for pent-up emotions and adventurous spirits the movies pre-

vent as much crime and immorality as they cause. Social workers in England almost without exception testified that for thousands of city children the movies offer a healthier atmosphere than their homes.

Recently the Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America prepared a list of eleven topics which were to be eliminated from moving pictures in the future. These were:

1. Profanity . . . this includes the words, God, Lord, Jesus, Christ (unless they be used reverentially in ceremonies), Hell, damn, Gawd, and every other profane and vulgar expression however it may be spelled; 2. Any licentious or suggestive nudity — in fact or in silhouette; and any lecherous or licentious notice thereof by other characters in the picture; 3. The illegal traffic in drugs; 4. Any inference of sex perversion; 5. White slavery; 6. Miscegenation (sex relationships between white and black races); 7. Sex hygiene and venereal diseases; 8. Scenes of actual childbirth — in fact or in silhouette; 9. Children's sex organs; 10. Ridicule of the clergy; 11. Willful offense to any nation, race, or creed. [They also recommend that great care be exercised in the treatment of the following subjects:] 1. The use of the flag; 2. International relations (avoid picturing in an unfavorable light another country's religion, history, institutions, prominent people, and citizenry); 3. Religion and religious ceremonies; 4. Arson; 5. Use of firearms; 6. Theft, robbery, safe-cracking, etc.; 7. Brutality . . . ; 8. Technique of committing murder by whatever method; 9. Methods of smuggling; 10. Third-degree methods; 11. Actual hangings or electrocutions as legal punishments for crime; 12. Sympathy for criminals; 13. Attitude toward public characters and institutions; 14. Sedition; 15. Apparent cruelty to children and animals; 16. Branding of people or animals; 17. The sale of women, or a woman selling her virtue; 18. Rape or attempted rape; 19. First night scenes; 20. Man and woman in bed together; 21. Deliberate seduction of girls; 22. The institution of marriage; 23. Surgical opera-

tions; 24. The use of drugs; 25. Titles or scenes having to do with law enforcement or law enforcement officers; 26. Excessive or lustful kissing, particularly when one character or the other is a "heavy."

A word should be said for the part the movies are playing in the musical education of America. The orchestras and organs which form part of the standard equipment of the better picture houses are not entirely given over to jazz mania. Not infrequently they offer a higher type of entertainment than the screen whose accessories they are. In many cases it would be more elevating if the movie were omitted and the musical program extended. Consider, for example, the following program from the World's Greatest Theater — "Roxy's," in New York.

PROCESSIONAL AND TABLEAU

La Grande Pâque Russe ---------- Rimsky-Korsakov
Kamennoi-Ostrow ---------- Rubinstein
Hallelujah ---------- Handel

A Musical and Pictorial Sensation
With Roxy Symphony Orchestra and Organs
Chorus and Entire Ensemble

Voices of Spring ---------- Strauss
Beatrice Belkin, Nicholas Daks, Company of 70

DIVERTISSEMENTS: LA DANSE

Virginie Mauret — Roxy Ballet Corps — Thirty-Two Roxyettes, the Smartest Dancing Group on B'way

[and then follows the picture]
William Fox Presents the Comedy Sensation
"WHY SAILORS GO WRONG"
with Sally Phipps — Nick Stuart

The problem of the movies is not so much one of saving

us from immorality as it is of saving them from their own dull-witted chiefs. Most of them are not so immoral as they are inane.

When in October, 1927, Warner Brothers presented the first serious all-talking picture, *The Jazz Singer,* featuring Al Jolson, they precipitated a revolution in the movie world. This picture met with an immediate and enthusiastic reception. Costing between $30,000 and $50,000 to produce, it grossed a total of $1,500,000. The movie magnates had been toying with the idea of talking pictures for some time, but this demonstration of the profit to be made from sound pictures started a stampede which has not yet run its course.

In an effort to satisfy the demand for novelty which seems to be a characteristic of the American public, exhibitors had been forced to resort to all manner of "stunts" to fill their expanding auditoriums. Vaudeville artists, musical programs, elaborate tableaux, and preludes had become a recognized and necessary feature of all leading theaters. In the 10 per cent of the better houses, which accounted for 75 per cent of the exhibitors' revenue, these extras had become the central attraction, with the movie itself as incidental. The coming of the talkies acted as a much needed stimulant and saved the movies from the doldrums. By the winter of 1929-30 fully half the productions were sound pictures; and by the end of 1930 it is predicted that 85 per cent of the movie houses will be equipped with sound apparatus.

It is somewhat ironical that just at the time when the work of such men as Lubitsch, Chaplin, Jannings, Murneau, Pabst, Conrad Veidt, and the Russian producers gave promise of greater excellence in the silent drama, the talkie appeared. It is comforting to learn that Chaplin will remain

in the silent field. He plans to organize a new company, erect new studios, and set aside five million dollars a year for producing silent pictures. But in spite of such exceptions the talkie is the order of the day.

Like the silent movie, the talking picture must meet a mass taste. Since production is even more expensive than in the case of ordinary movies, the talkies must be designed to appeal to an even larger public. Furthermore, since the talkies are made by the same people, with the same motive, and for substantially the same public, it is too much to expect that they will differ materially in content from the movies. If the silent films were obsessed with sex, sensationalism, and sentiment, the talkies have not escaped a similar obsession. There is little evidence thus far to justify the theory that they will rise much above the level of the moving pictures which they have displaced.

Many of the talking pictures, such as *Bulldog Drummond*, *The Trial of Mary Duggan*, and *The Cock-eyed World*, provide a fair type of entertainment. Some few have been more ambitious. George Arliss in a talking version of *Disraeli* has in some ways improved upon the stage play of the same name. Yet, as Alexander Bakshy points out, "the characters, natural as they are, appear to lack the essential warmth, material solidity, and individual isolation of real people." Douglas Fairbanks and Mary Pickford have produced a talking version of *The Taming of the Shrew*. In spite of the greater flexibility of the movie technique, and notwithstanding the excellent manner in which Fairbanks speaks his lines, the production is disappointing. Palpably playing down to his audience, Mr. Fairbanks has emasculated the wit of Shakspere in favor of gymnastics. The duel of wits between

Petruchio and Katharine becomes little more than a "rough house" of the slapstick variety.

The average run of talkies, like the average run of silent movies, caters to the lowest common denominator of public taste. *The Hollywood Revue, Fox Movietone Follies, Broadway Melody, Rio Rita, The Vagabond Lover, Jealousy, Party Girl, Midnight Daddies* are representative. Thus far they have been mere echoes of mediocre stage plays or musical revues of the burlesque type. "But it is said," writes George Jean Nathan, "that there will yet develop in time playwrights who will write original plays for the talkies that will convert them into something worth while. The same thing, let us remember, was said about the silent movies. . . . The talkies, it is reasonable to assume, will go along exactly as the silent movies did. One out of every five hundred talkies, like one out of every five hundred movies, may conceivably have some fairly intelligent stuff in it. . . . A movie public that for thirteen years has consistently made purveyors of sex rich will hardly be converted suddenly into a public that craves Y.M.C.A. films."

There are unquestionably great possibilities in the talking pictures. It is possible through this new medium to bring good music, even grand opera, and the better Broadway plays to small towns where the cultural fare has been meager. Lawrence Tibbett, of the Metropolitan Opera Company, has blazed a tentative trail in *The Rogue Song*.

But there is a seamy side. If the silent movies were a boon to musicians, since no first-class show house was complete without an orchestra, the talkies bid fair to be a blight. Music, which formerly accompanied an entire picture as an aid in interpreting the action of the screen, must now be cut

down or eliminated, since it interferes with the dialogue. Where music is used, one orchestra at the studio can now serve ten thousand theaters; and many exhibitors have dispensed with their orchestras.

The American Federation of Musicians, representing 158,000 members, has declared war on the "canned" music of the talkies. Those artists who are employed in recording sound pictures are temporarily in clover. Whereas they formerly earned between $75 and $100 a week in the better theaters, they are now receiving as much as $10 an hour at the studio. Yet, as Maurice Mermey says, "as they record *Ramona* or *Souvenir* or something from Chopin, they realize that each song is a dirge — a funeral hymn for the vanishing fiddler." President Weber, of the American Federation of Musicians, fears that this situation augurs ill for the future of music in America, since it will destroy the incentive to musical study.

One could easily exaggerate the dangers inherent in this state of affairs. In spite of the radio and the talkies, there are over fifty major orchestras in the United States. In this respect we compare favorably with most European countries. Furthermore, over half of the twenty million children in our schools study music. It is exceedingly doubtful that any mechanical device will ever displace such artists as Kreisler, Paderewski, Casals, Galli-Curci, and Rethberg.

Similar fears have been expressed concerning the effect of the talkies upon the legitimate drama. But here too there are forces at work to counteract the stultifying standardization of the Hollywood dynasty. The widespread and vigorous Little Theater movement and the fact that hundreds of thousands of youngsters in the public schools are receiving

practical instruction in the drama will do much to offset the baneful influence of a mechanized theater. "The one thoroughly accurate statement which I can make," says Kenneth Macgowan, "is that an extraordinary new audience is being born in the high schools of the United States. They will come out looking for something besides talkies."

The talkies may exert an unfortunate influence in another respect. As a writer in *School and Society*, February 2, 1929, says: "The talkies will make Hollywood the slang center of the United States. . . . A wisecrack recorded in Hollywood will be heard in all corners of the country months before the same quip could travel from town to town across the continent with a road show or a vaudeville troupe." What effect this will have upon the American language, time alone will tell.

2. The Radio

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience. This is station WYZ, broadcasting from Kruther's roof. . . . We have with us tonight the Kruther's quartet, of the famous Kruther's canneries. The first number on the program will be that old-time favorite, *When You and I Were Young, Maggie,* — followed by *Congratulations.* You will be glad to hear that we have with us also the Heavenly Harmonizers, of the United Harness Company, who will give us a half hour of classical melodies, including such favorites as *Roses of Picardy, Mother Machree,* the prisoner's song from *Il Trovatore,* and Irving Berlin's immortal piece, *Because I Love You.*

Music in the air, from countless jazz bands and songsters; morality in the air, from S. Parkes Cadman and Harry Fosdick; stock quotations, recipes for doughnuts, political speeches, true stories, and royal receptions drifting through

the ether. In the hum of it all, philosophers ponder on what will come of this ethereal monster which in ten short years has become a billion-dollar enterprise. "The two outstanding events on the air this week," says the New York *Times* for July 17, 1927, [will be] the Dempsey-Sharkey fight on Thursday night and a concert by Arthur Pryor's band on Saturday." For the prize fight, "the radio net will be the largest since the Lindbergh celebrations. . . . Between twelve and fourteen thousand miles of wire line will be utilized, and the listeners will number more than 30,000,000." It is illegal to ship fight films in interstate commerce, but the radio brings every "battle of the century" into the very homes of millions. Not only the male adults but the mothers and kiddies can now "listen in" as the Manassa Mauler delivers a "vicious left" to the Bull of the Pampas.

Eight years ago there was one radio broadcasting station; today there are close to 700. In 1920 a receiving set was a rarity; today there are between twelve and fifteen million sets, capable of reaching an audience of forty millions. Officials of the National Broadcasting Company estimate that "the average family uses the radio 850 hours a year." Like all new things, the radio has been heralded as revolutionary. It is, say the fans, going to transform our politics, music, literature, and religion. Certainly its potentialities are great. The modern politician transcends the limits of time and space. His voice can be heard in every village and hamlet in the land and heard more distinctly than on the outskirts of a large crowd. Direct democracy for a nation of 120,000,000 is no longer impossible. Governor Roosevelt, of New York, has used the radio repeatedly to defend his policies before the people. Formerly a candidate could talk to at most

10,000 people. It is said that D. L. Moody, during a long and busy life, talked to 100,000,000. In 1928 Hoover and Smith in a few brief months must have talked to as many. Some $2,000,000 was spent on radio by the two parties, ten times as much as they spent on newspaper advertising. Smith delivered eighteen and Hoover, eight speeches. The Republicans used a battery of 6,000 radio five-minute spellbinders.

The radio audience presents a marked contrast to that of the old-time political rally. Here is no place for red fire, bonbons, and parades. Jazz bands and vaudeville artists can help but little, for the magic presence of "the people's choice" is not here. The roar of the mob is gone. Al Smith over the radio is flat compared to the happy warrior on the platform. Campaigning by radio is like a house-to-house canvass by a mysterious stranger. "The radio," says General J. G. Harbord, "is the greatest debunking influence that has come into American public life since the Declaration of Independence." It is no longer possible, he says, to bury the crowd with bunk. No longer is the audience at the mercy of the speaker. It requires less courage to turn the dial and shut off the spouting Demosthenes than to arise and walk boldly out of the hall. But it is easy to exaggerate the influence of the radio. Ordinarily elections are not won by speeches but by spoils, actual or prospective, not by oratory but by organization. Only a small portion of the American electorate is influenced by reason, and the radio takes the spice out of the campaign. Fifteen minutes before the loud speaker is equivalent to an hour in a hall. Radio speeches must be prepared in advance, and prepared speeches are noted for their length and dullness. In the last campaign only Al Smith dared to

extemporize. A moment of hesitation, a single stumble over a word, and the phantom audience will fade. From sheer boredom the listener turns the dial to Paul Whiteman or the A. and P. Gypsies and goes to the polls to vote the ticket of his fathers as though there were no such things as radios. Unfortunately there is no sure way of checking up on the influence of radio-oratory. The Democratic National Committee requested the listeners to write in. Within a few weeks 100,000 letters and 10,000 telegrams were received. The committee said that $2,000 spent on a radio appeal for funds produced $100,000 in contributions. It has since been admitted that this was, like the news of Mark Twain's death, greatly exaggerated. More significant is the fact that one radio appeal brought in over 22,000 contributions within a week.

Mass education is the order of the day, and the radio its finest flower. Why bother to read dull books on literature, philosophy, and science? Resign yourself to the downy comfort of an easy chair and let the wisdom of the ages float in. Just at a time when educators have begun to point out the deficiencies of the lecture method, radio enthusiasts propose to lecture the whole nation into a love for Shakspere, Cervantes, Aristotle, and Aquinas. On November 12, 1928, the Radio Commission granted permission for the construction in Orange County, California, of a 50,000 watt broadcasting station for a university of the air. A plant costing $2,000,000 will be erected. Music, drama, literature, history, and political science are among the subjects to be taught. Nor is this the only straw in the wind. Fifty per cent of the schools of New Jersey and 25 per cent of those in Nebraska have receiving sets. Ohio recently appropriated several thousand

dollars to put radio sets in the public schools. Universities and agricultural schools in Wisconsin, Iowa, Ohio, Kansas, Oregon, South Dakota, Minnesota, Alabama, and New York are broadcasting extension courses. Most educators, however, who have experimented with the radio are now convinced that, except for current events and the appreciation of music, it has but small value, although agricultural and business talks are surprisingly popular. The radio has not yet blazed a royal road to learning. He must be an optimist indeed who can believe that learned lectures on paleontology and politics can compete with the Studebaker Champions or Will Rogers.

The American radio is financed by the advertiser. Its value as an advertising medium depends upon the size of the audience it reaches. Consequently it is necessary to cater to the tastes of the average man. The universal common denominator is music. Charles Merz studied the programs of ten of the smaller stations and found that out of 294 hours 28 were given over to talks, 77 to more or less serious music, and 189 hours were devoted to jazz. For the ten larger stations, out of 357 hours their offering was 56 for talks, 42 for serious music, and 259 for jazz. The proportion is about four hours of syncopation to one of education. Out of 900 items in the average week-end program, says Blanche Bloch, "less than a dozen can be seriously taken as music." The radio is a new Cap and Bells, bearing the standards of Campbell's Soup, Ipana Tooth Paste, and Cliquot Club. It is the custom to get the serious parts of the program over early, when the audience is small. They are, so to speak, the minor bouts preceding the main event. The Coward Comfort Shoe Company promised thirty minutes with

our greatest poets and gave readings from Longfellow, Whittier, Bryant, and Riley. By some happy miracle Edgar Guest was overlooked. Where, one asks, were Walt Whitman, Edwin Arlington Robinson, Stephen Vincent Benét, Edna St. Vincent Millay, and Carl Sandburg?

"The guests sit around the radio," says Jack Woodward in the March, 1929, *Forum*, "and sip watered gin and listen to so-called music interspersed with long lists of bargains to be had at Whosit's Department Stores." But there is another side to the shield. Not all the voices of the night are sound and fury. In October, 1928, Walter Damrosch began to broadcast, over a national hook-up, symphony concerts for children. During the ten days following the first concert the National Broadcasting Company received twenty-five thousand laudatory letters from listeners, and they have been coming in by the hundreds every day since. These concerts are reaching in the neighborhood of twelve to fifteen million children, many of whom, on isolated farms and in out-of-the-way places, would otherwise never hear a symphony. One can only lament the fact that Bernarr McFadden's "True Story" hour elicited a response almost twice as great. The New York Edison Company, realizing that, for the most part, the radio audience is musically illiterate, has supplemented its concerts with printed booklets containing information about the various musical instruments and brief descriptions of the concert numbers to be offered. The lectures on public affairs over WEAF, in New York, by the National League of Women Voters, by David Lawrence, and by the Foreign Policy Association, have proved more popular than even the most sanguine dared to hope. Recently the radio audience has even listened to King George of Eng-

land. The nonsectarian sermons of Cadman, Fosdick, and Poling are doing much to raise religion above the level of the Holy Rollers. Over seventy thousand letters to Dr. Cadman alone give evidence of their popularity. On the whole the radio has rarely descended to the level of the average moving picture.*

* Daniel Starch has recently completed a study of program preferences among radio listeners. The following figures give the percentage of families in each group mentioning each type of program among the first five preferences:

	Farm Families (Per Cent)	*Town Families (Per Cent)*	*Small-City Families (Per Cent)*	*Large-City Families (Per Cent)*	*Total Families All Groups (Per Cent)*	*Total Number of Families East of Rockies*
Orchestras	56.99	64.53	62.49	64.19	62.05	5,598,099
Popular Entertainers	53.32	55.36	49.06	55.19	53.23	4,803,138
Dance	38.17	47.48	42.92	54.32	45.72	4,125,483
Musical	46.68	54.39	34.07	36.16	42.82	3,863,805
Semi-classical Music	24.10	41.02	48.89	44.52	39.63	3,575,960
Short Talks on Interesting Subjects	46.51	42.57	34.15	36.22	39.86	3,596,714
Religious Service	47.85	35.66	35.22	27.16	36.47	3,290,822
Classical Music	17.29	27.58	41.03	43.30	32.30	2,914,547
Athletic Reports	21.06	26.61	28.26	22.93	24.72	2,230,576
Grand Opera	10.93	16.60	27.85	31.75	21.78	1,963,289
Comedy	19.00	15.18	16.22	12.88	15.82	1,427,497
Crops and Market Reports	45.16	11.63	5.65	4.59	16.76	1,512,316
Plays	14.43	11.18	11.79	13.81	12.80	1,154,991
Educational Service	13.98	12.21	13.10	7.66	11.74	1,059,343
Children's Programs	14.25	8.27	8.03	6.85	9.35	843,685
Domestic Science Service	9.14	9.43	9.75	5.17	8.37	755,256
Drama	4.57	5.68	6.55	6.38	5.80	523,355
Physical Exercises	3.67	4.20	3.19	4.88	3.99	360,032
Uncertain	3.86	3.30	2.71	4.24	3.53	

Preferences for most of the different types of programs are practically

It is because romanticists take seriously the outrageous claims of the radio promoters that criticism arises. If the radio made fewer claims to being a new messiah there would be less to "kick" about.

If it is on harmony and rhythm that the radio puts its emphasis, rather than on its little sallies into national budgets, its ten-minute lectures on the genesis and evolution of the Dawes plan, and its tonight-let-us-spend-five-minutes-with-the-poets, there is nothing strange about the fact and certainly nothing reprehensible [says Charles Merz]. If even the biggest stations give four times as many hours to syncopation as they give to science, drama, literature, art, and history, there is nothing deplorable about the fact. For, after all, there are plenty of ways in which to study science, drama, literature, art, and history, aside from listening in on short snatches of lectures which may begin somewhere in the middle and end by being interrupted by a band. The radio ought not to be criticized if it fails to take over the functions of laboratories, books, and art museums. They are out of its line. It has a function of its own.

If the radio is to elevate and educate the public, it must be freed from the domination of the advertisers, and yet it is upon them that most broadcasting depends. In England broadcasting is a government monopoly. Each owner of a receiving set pays an annual fee of twelve shillings, from which the government derives in the neighborhood of $5,000,000 annually to pay for the programs. As a consequence, says Dr. R. A. Millikan, "the program that is on the air in England is incomparably superior to anything to be

the same on the part of farm, town, and city families. There are significant differences, however, with respect to several types of programs: semi-classical and classical music and grand opera are preferred less by farm and small-town families than by city families, whereas religious services, crop and market reports, and children's programs are preferred more by farm families than by city families.

heard here. . . . (The government) provides the radio-land public of England with the largest return in education and in entertainment for eight mills a night ever provided, I suspect, anywhere in the world." The adoption of some such plan is feasible in the United States but not highly probable. Stuart Chase suggests that the burden be placed upon radio equipment manufacturers. Perhaps some day we will have endowed radio stations as we now have endowed libraries and universities.

Since the commercial radio appeals to the average man, controversial subjects must be avoided. Sectarianism in religion or radicalism in politics must be kept out. No one out of harmony with accepted creeds is welcome before the more important microphones. It is for this reason that labor organizations, reform groups, and various churches are erecting stations of their own. H. V. Kaltenborn, who gave a radio hour on current events for the Brooklyn *Eagle*, relates the following incident:

My chief troubles in radio broadcasting have arisen out of my disagreement with the State Department on the recognition of Soviet Russia. I have no sympathy with communism or with the Soviet government, but I feel that the best way to help the Russian people to a better government is by granting recognition. I cautiously expressed this belief through station WEAF, in New York City, linked up at the time with station WCAP, in Washington. There was an immediate explosion in high places. Just what happened I do not know. The Brooklyn *Eagle*'s contract was unceremoniously canceled without explanation. Since that time, despite my continued popularity as a speaker through other radio stations and on numerous platforms, the American Telegraph and Telephone Company has barred me from its station. . . . It is quite possible that if the Brooklyn *Eagle* were a Republican newspaper, whose editors could be counted on to

give support to most administration policies, I would still be *persona grata.*

In 1923 William J. Burns viciously attacked over the radio various liberal organizations. The American Civil Liberties Union offered to put Norman Hapgood or Robert Morse Lovett on the air to answer these charges, but none of the larger stations would permit it. It is significant that on May 1, 1930, the spread-eagle oratory of Hamilton Fish to the war veterans at Union Square, New York, was broadcast over a national hookup, whereas the speeches at a communist meeting immediately afterward were not put on the air. This is especially interesting since May 1 is International Labor Day.

The air is no longer free. It is filled with the outpourings of some seven hundred stations. Since there are only eighty-nine wave lengths available and these are capable of carrying not more than 550 stations, the air is overcrowded. Most of the smaller stations do not amount to a hill of beans. Fifty of the larger stations are said to attract 90 per cent of the radio audience. There are a few maintained by special groups which broadcast their ideas to a limited audience. But many of them seek to make money as advertising media. John Brinkley operates KFKB in Milford, Kansas, to tell the public about the glories of his "rejuvenation" operations. WHT broadcasts the wonder of Salicon, and WJAZ was until recently telling people how Professor Scholder could make hair grow on bald heads. "Over KTNT," says Stuart Chase, "of Muscatine, Iowa, comes the story of the 'Tangley Institute' with its sure-fire cure for varicose veins." KWKH, operated by W. K. Henderson, at Shreveport, Louisiana, is devoted to denunciation of the chain stores. Recently Sen-

ator Dill, of Washington, asked the Federal Radio Commission to stop the broadcasting of "obscene language" over this station.

The radio as an advertising medium has aroused the ire of many newspaper men who fear that it cuts into their revenue. For $5,000 a product may be advertised in fifteen cities over the so-called Red Network. Many advertisers "feel that the same amount of money spent in newspapers in these cities would not make a correspondingly great impression." It has been estimated that radio broadcasting reaches an audience equal to the combined circulation of the two thousand daily newspapers in America. A recent estimate in *Editor and Publisher* says that advertisers are spending in the neighborhood of seven to twenty millions on radio and thus taking bread out of the mouths of newspapers and magazines. On the other hand, Arthur Williams, of the New York Edison Company, says:

> Radio does not take the place of the newspaper in any sense — rather it supplements and, in my opinion, aids the newspapers, just as the newspapers, through the splendid publicity they give radio programs, aid in the better appreciation and larger development of the radio itself.

But this "splendid publicity" which the newspapers give radio programs has been a sore point with the publishers. Many of them feel that radio advertisers should pay for the publication of their programs, and many of them do. By and large, however, these announcements are published without charge. In printing the program of the Studebaker Quartet, or the A. and P. Gypsies, the newspaper is giving free advertising to these concerns. A recent symposium of the American Newspaper Publisher's Association shows

that a majority of them favor "paid space for radio programs." When one considers the free space given to professional sports and theatricals it would seem that the radio broadcasters have a legitimate grievance against this discrimination. Certainly radio programs, whatever may be their advertising value, constitute news to countless readers.

"Some of us," says Frank Arnold, of the National Broadcasting Company, "go so far as to feel that broadcast advertising, even of itself, is not adapted for any general campaign when sponsored by an advertiser entirely unknown to the readers of newspapers and magazines; but when given the support of a newspaper and magazine campaign properly worked out, it serves to increase reader interest and develop sales volume." It should be mentioned too that the radio industry has contributed heavily to the advertising income of newspapers. In 1926, for example, it ranked next to Amusement and Automobiles in advertising linage in New York papers.

Since it is to the advertiser that the public is indebted for its radio programs, it is fair to ask what return he gets from his expenditures. He cannot deliver a lecture on the excellencies of his product or spend much time telling the public why it should buy his brand of shoes rather than another. The "great unseen" wants entertainment, not sales talk. This means that the most the advertiser can expect is to have his name mentioned briefly as the sponsor of the program and hope that this will result in promoting good will. He casts his bread upon the air and hopes it will come back laden with orders. Just how effective this is, it is impossible to say. In January, 1928, the Dodge Brothers Motor Company launched its new Victory Six with a national hook-up. The

entertainers included Will Rogers in his California home, Al Jolson in New Orleans, where he had been specially sent for the purpose, and Fred and Dorothy Stone in Chicago. Forty-seven stations were linked at a cost of $35,000, in addition to $25,000 paid to the four entertainers. How many who listened to that program knew who was sponsoring it, and how many of those who knew could or would buy Dodge cars because of it? How many people know that the Royal Typewriter Company paid $35,000 to broadcast the first Tunney-Dempsey prize fight? A good deal of radio advertising is glorified rooster-crowing, a leap in the dark. Many careful students of the radio are convinced that it is not an effective advertising medium except for those who are engaged in the manufacture of radio equipment. "The advertiser," says Roy Durstine, "gets back from the radio just what he puts into it — in unselfishness, in friendliness, in sincerity." But after all, what the advertiser wants is sales, not sentiment. If current events could be broadcast in the manner suggested by H. I. Phillips, of the New York *Sun*, they might yield tangible results:

Good evening, folks. The first dispatch I have here comes from Chillicothe, Ohio. It says that four people were seriously injured under the auspices of the Great Eastern Pretzel Bending Company, benders of fine pretzels, when a Buick Sedan, product of General Motors Company, America's largest producers of motor cars, crashed into a trolley car by arrangement with the Paramount Carbonated Water Corporation. The injured are Lester Mooch, maker of unexcelled Havana leaf cigars; Milton Caraway, Chillicothe's leading plumber, whose precast pipe is known wherever good plumbing is esteemed; Mrs. Hilda Goggins, originator of the Goggins health wheat cakes, and Luther Pratt, vice president of Pratt, Mooney, and Veech, whose comfy shoes are worn everywhere. It was announced by Dr. Strick-

land Blitz, founder of the Strickland Blitz Sanitarium, that they would recover.

The next item is from Carson City, Nevada. It says: Jasper Clinker, prominent business man, was found stabbed today in his Smith and Wiggins Built bungalow. The last person seen with him, according to the International Shellac Corporation, makers of Everlast Shellac, was a Miss Sadie Woonck, it was stated by the Federal Animal Cracker Company, whose animal crackers are eaten by all fastidious cracker lovers. Etc., etc.*

The radio is competing with the newspaper not only as an advertiser but as a purveyor of news. The National Radio Press Association, Inc., has recently been organized to supply radio stations with news written in a manner suitable for broadcasting. "Combine radio and television," says a writer in the *Century*, "with a gigantic device for recording and reproducing world news the moment it happens — and

* The broadcasting companies, however, cite numerous illustrations to prove that radio advertising does pay. In the first place, they point to the fact that the average radio listener is economically superior to the average newspaper reader. A recent survey shows that the rental of radio homes is about 40 per cent in excess of the rental of homes without radio. Fifteen per cent of the radio homes were found to be those of professional men; 14.79 per cent, major executives or proprietors; 7.85 per cent, minor executives; 14.36 per cent, skilled manual laborers; 20.10 per cent, farmers; and the balance, miscellaneous.

Frank Blanchard, advertising director of Cities Service Company, says that radio advertising has been very helpful in promoting sales. He cites the fact that "a salesman in Dallas, Texas, closed a contract for 9,000 gallons [of gasoline] a month as the result of a contact brought about by our radio concerts." Sales amounting to two thousand shares of stock were made in one city as the direct result of broadcasting. A mailing list of over ten thousand names has been compiled from letters received from the radio audience asking for information about Cities Service. Cities Service is spending something like $300,000 a year on radio broadcasting.

From one radio announcement of a new bottled gas, "Shellane," the Shell Company received 410 letters of inquiry, the majority of which led to actual sales.

Dozens of similar illustrations might be cited. That business men are convinced of the value of radio broadcasting may be inferred from the fact that during the first six months of 1928 seventy national advertisers used time on a single broadcasting chain.

even the picturized tabloid is doomed as a pallid, antiquarian method of keeping abreast of the times." But the radio is severely handicapped as a news agency. Its listeners must take what is offered them; they have no choice except to tune off. Most readers prefer to pick and choose what they shall read. They care little for current events anyway. The average reader spends about ten minutes on his newspaper, but in that time he can learn the latest about the race track, the League of Nations, or whatever may be of most interest to him. The most patient of them will not endure more than ten minutes of news over the radio, and a ten-minute talk on current world affairs is likely to be of small interest or value.

The radio audience is a sensitive one. The National Broadcasting Company receives some 85,000 letters each month from its listeners. Perhaps no other agency of public opinion has such a direct and immediate response. Broadcasters do not *guess* what the public wants, they *know*, and their programs are a reflection of public taste as perhaps nothing else is. Significant in this connection is the code of ethics recently adopted by the National Broadcasters Association:

1. Recognizing that the radio audience includes persons of all ages and all types of political, social, and religious belief, every broadcaster will endeavor to prevent the broadcasting of any matter which would be commonly regarded as offensive.
2. When the facilities of a broadcaster are used by others than the owner, the broadcaster shall ascertain the financial responsibility and character of such client, that no dishonest, fraudulent, or dangerous person, firm, or organization may gain access to the radio audience.
3. Matter barred from the mails as fraudulent, deceptive, or obscene shall not be broadcast.
4. Every broadcaster shall exercise caution in accepting any

advertising matter regarding products or service which may be injurious to health.

5. No broadcaster shall permit the broadcasting of advertising statements or claims which he knows or believes to be false, deceptive, or grossly exaggerated.

6. Every broadcaster shall strictly follow the provisions of the radio law of 1927 regarding the clear identification of sponsored or paid-for material.

7. Care should be taken to prevent the broadcasting of statements derogatory to other stations, individuals, or competing products or services, except where the law specifically provides that the station has no right of censorship.

Gilbert Seldes, writing in the *New Republic*, summarizes his view of the radio as follows:

It hardly seems possible that so many things could be of interest, that so many people would be trying to sell or persuade or exploit. Maxwell House Coffee presents old Southern Melodies; . . . the political situation is summarized by Frederick William Wile; . . . Aimee McPherson wishes that she could tell you how lovely Jesus has been to her; . . . a lesson in Spanish from the municipality's own station; a plea for Jews to speak Hebrew; how to take care of an Airedale; Al Smith addresses the newsboys; . . . a faint hum of jazz accompanies a Catholic priest; a prize fight cuts into Bach; as you rapidly turn the dial from one end of the gauge to the other, you hear grunts and shrieks and the wild whistle of static. *It is everything that America is interested in; it is America.* [Italics mine.]

3. Books

"Books rule the world," said Voltaire. From Genesis to Gogol, from Deuteronomy to Dreiser, books have influenced the lives of men. It would be presumptuous to attempt an appraisal of the influence which literature has had upon human behavior and opinion. The "battle of the books" is

more than a struggle of rival scribblers, it is the record of man's attempt to adjust himself to the world and justify himself in the sight of God. Old blind Homer gave eloquent voice to the glories of the Greeks. For ages his epics were the corner stone of Greek education. Historians study the heroic age through the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, the *Nibelungen Lied*, the *Volsunga Saga*, and the *Song of Roland*. For a thousand years Aristotle's books ruled men's minds. The writings of the Philosopher were the embodiment of all virtue, truth, and light. Who can appraise the influence of the Bible? It not only lies at the basis of western civilization but, translated into 169 languages and circulated by the hundreds of millions, its influence is world-wide. Men have lived and died according to its precepts, it has unseated kings and overturned vast empires, it has sent men into battle, on crusades, and over stormy seas. To millions it is the North Star of their lives. Yet who can say what its influence would have been but for the *Summa Theologica* of Aquinas, Augustine's *City of God*, or the *Institutes* of Calvin?

Statesmen from the Medicis to Mussolini, from Henry VIII to William Hohenzollern, have modeled their lives upon Machiavelli's *Prince*. John Locke's *Treatises on Government*, Montesquieu's *Spirit of Laws*, and Rousseau's *Social Contract* gave direction and form to the American Constitution. The books of Galileo, Sir Isaac Newton, and Descartes shattered a civilization and planted within the chrysalis of the old the seeds of the new. Today modernists and fundamentalists wage a mighty war of words, and one major cause of conflict is Darwin's *Origin of Species*. The contemporary struggle between capitalists and communists

might well be written as the struggle between two books — *The Wealth of Nations,* by Adam Smith, and *Capital,* by Karl Marx. So skillfully did Shakspere mirror the experiences and emotions of mankind that a German editor once said his works were an "integral part of nature and therefore above criticism."

What books have most influenced public opinion in the United States? We will not attempt a conclusive answer. But surely no history of America can overlook the part played by *Uncle Tom's Cabin* and *Ten Nights in a Bar Room* in bringing about abolition and prohibition. The former sold over a million copies. It is reported that Lincoln, upon meeting Harriet Beecher Stowe, said: "So this is the little lady that made the Great War?" To this day Simon Legree is a symbol of injustice and cruelty.

All the newer idol-breaking biographies have not succeeded in effacing the myths which Parson Weems wove about the figure of George Washington. The cherry tree tale which he invented remains in the minds of most Americans an outstanding incident in the life of the "father of his country." The pious platitudes of Benjamin Franklin, collected and quoted in a thousand schoolbooks, continue to be regarded as pearls of wisdom and are held up as the surest guides to health, wealth, and happiness. Few Americans literally follow them — but neither did the wily Benjamin.

The men who have ruled America for the past three generations were reared on McGuffey's readers. From them they received their first and, in many cases, their most lasting impressions. These readers taught integrity, honesty, industry, temperance, patriotism, kindness to animals and

men, politeness, and cleanliness. If these men have failed to live by the moral admonitions of McGuffey, it is because the real so frequently falls short of the ideal. The essential truth of McGuffey they never question. He repeated most of the myths of American history, adding embellishments of his own. His *Sixth Reader* contained 138 selections from 111 different authors, from Bryant to Webster, and from each piece and story McGuffey drew a moral. Millions of Americans got whatever taste for literature they have from McGuffey. He took the malleable minds of American children and made them puritans and patriots. According to Herbert Quick, "These textbooks constitute the most influential volumes ever published in America." From 1836 to 1920 they had gone into hundreds of editions — a total of 122,000,000 copies. He who would understand the American mind must take account of McGuffey.

What the movie is to contemporary youngsters the "dime novel" was to those of an earlier day. The West has not yet lived down the reputation for outlawry and violence which these stories conveyed. Others of them spread the notion that the city is the home of vice and sin, that in the gas-lit glare of its streets anything is possible. Who has not read at least one of the one hundred and nineteen novels of Horatio Alger? A poor boy battling his way through misfortune and adversity to success is the theme of them all. It is the American epic of "the man on the make." Frugality, industry, honesty, faithfulness in the performance of tasks assigned, inevitably bring rewards in money and prestige. How many of his books were sold is unknown, but they must have run into millions. Alger's biographer, with unnecessary zeal, says of him:

Alger is a name better known [in America] than Dickens or Tolstoi or Balzac or Hawthorne. His name in America is better known than Shakspere, his writings more widely read. . . . The nation believed in him and hailed him as one who was directing its young citizenry along righteous paths. . . . With his poor, cheap novels he exercised a sway which no writer in this country, before or since, has been able to equal.

Lewis Butcher, manager of the Newsboy's Lodging House, in New York, says that Alger's stories have caused and still cause more boys to run away from home to seek their fortunes than any other circumstance with which he is familiar.

Less well-known but deserving of mention are the political novels. *Democracy: An American Novel*, by Henry Adams, laid bare the spoils system in its widest ramifications. The book went through sixteen editions and is said to have played a not inconsiderable rôle in promoting civil service reform. The novels of Winston Churchill, notably *Coniston* and *Mr. Crewe's Career*, gave graphic accounts of the corrupt alliance between big business and the political machine. It is commonly believed that it was the influence of *Mr. Crewe's Career* that caused the attorney general of New Hampshire "to proceed against the railroads for violating a statutory obligation for over a score of years." Paul Leicester Ford's novel *The Honorable Peter Stirling* is the first to portray the evils of boss-controlled cities and the futility of reformers who fight without organization. The novel is a textbook for the "practical idealist" in politics. Although it ran into fifty-three editions, its influence was slight compared to *The Shame of the Cities*, by Lincoln Steffens. This book, dealing in facts, not fiction, helped to arouse American opinion to remedy some of the worst

abuses of municipal government. Other books by the so-called muckrakers were likewise factual studies of business and politics. *Frenzied Finance*, by Thomas Lawson, *The Octopus* and *The Pit*, by Frank Norris, *The History of Great American Fortunes* and *Tammany Hall*, by Gustavus Myers, and *The History of the Standard Oil Company*, by Ida Tarbell, did much to tear the veil of sanctimonious hypocrisy from American masters of capital and their political hirelings.

The Jungle, by Upton Sinclair, dealing with the beef trust, was perhaps more immediately influential than any novel before or since. It is the most vivid and effective unmasking of American industrial feudalism that has appeared in print. Many historians do not hesitate to give Sinclair credit for so crystallizing public opinion as to force the passage of the Pure Food and Drug Act. *The Jungle*, it was said, spoiled the public's appetite for meat. The typical point of view was expressed by Mr. Dooley:

> Dear, O dear, I haven't been able to ate annything more nourishin' thin a cucumber in a week. . . . A little while ago no wan cud square away a beefsteak with better grace thin meself. Today th' wurrud resthrant makes me green in th' face. How did it all come about? A young fellow wrote a book. Th' divil take him f'r writin' it. Hogan says it's a gr-rand book. It's wan iv th' gr-reatest books he iver read. It almost made him commit suicide. Th' hero got a fancy job poling food products out iv a catch basin, an' was promoted to scrapin' pure leaf lard off th' flure in th' glue facthry. Th' villain fell into a lard tank an' was not seen agin until he turned up at a fash'nable resthrant in New York. Ye'll see be this that 'tis a sweetly sintimental little volume, to be r-read durin' Lent. . . . If you want to rayjooce ye're butcher's bills, buy *The Jungle*.

The book has been compared to *Uncle Tom's Cabin*. "It is

a book," said Brisbane, "that does for industrial slavery what *Uncle Tom's Cabin* did for black slavery. But the work is done far better and more accurately in the *The Jungle*." It has been translated into seventeen languages and is still widely read.

In our own day novelists devote themselves less to probing social sores than to problems of individual and social adjustment. Psychoanalysis is the new fetish, and the disciples of Freud hold the center of the stage. The new history, biography, and fiction is filled with inferiority, Oedipus, and grandiose complexes, inspiring millions of readers to plumb the cesspools of their souls. Sherwood Anderson, fighting the frustrations of American civilization in *Winesburg, Ohio* and *A Story Teller's Story*, presents a picture of dullness, boredom, and internal conflict. Theodore Dreiser, with what Stuart Sherman calls "barbaric naturalism," lays bare the eternal conflict of morals with the mind. Yet even Dreiser cannot refrain from sermonizing, and in *An American Tragedy* he thunders at his readers, "The wages of sin is death." Sinclair Lewis, of all modern writers, has been most successful in substituting new stereotypes for old. *Main Street* has come to symbolize the drab hopelessness of small-town life. *Elmer Gantry*, with its distorted portrait of our "men of God," contains enough of truth to raise a riot among the ministry. *Babbitt* affords a convenient stereotype in the minds of "intellectuals" for classifying all members of Rotary, Kiwanis, Lions, and Commercial clubs. Indeed, in certain groups, Babbitt is equivalent to the ancient Greek's "barbarian" in describing all those outside their own scintillating circle. These books have already sold hundreds of thousands of copies.

Numerous books such as Dos Passos's *Three Soldiers*, Zweig's *Case of Sergeant Grischa*, and Remarque's *All Quiet on the Western Front* have portrayed war in all its hideousness and horror. Enthusiastic reviewers acclaim them as the "most potent arguments for peace in print." But notwithstanding the tremendous popularity and wide reading of these books, their influence in promoting pacifism has probably been grossly overestimated. Zola, Tolstoy, and Stephen Crane gave wide currency to the carnage and stupid confusion of war — yet they did not prevent the holocaust of 1914. When men's passions run high under a barrage of propaganda, when flags wave and bands play, the lessons which these books teach will be forgotten.

Henry L. Mencken has played a not inconspicuous rôle in debunking America. Spreading the stereotypes of Lewis, Dreiser, and himself, he has as great a following among the so-called intellectuals and would-be intellectuals as "Eddie" Guest has among what Mencken calls the "Babbittry." He may not inappropriately be called the Eddie Guest of the bushwhackers.

A word should be said concerning Edgar Guest — "poet of the plain people." When his ninth book of verse was finished, in 1928, his publishers offered a thousand-dollar prize for the best title. It is a tribute to Guest's popularity that half a million people submitted titles. He has to his credit over a thousand poems, and his books have been purchased by more than a million Americans. His poems, exuding sentiment about the flag, the home, and mother, touch the hearts of millions and give voice to ideals they cherish. No Rotary Club banquet is complete without a recital of that famous verse:

There are thousands to tell you it cannot be done,
There are thousands to prophecy failure;
There are thousands to point out to you one by one,
The dangers that wait to assail you.
But just buckle in with a bit of a grin,
Just take off your coat and go to it;
Just start in to sing as you tackle the thing
"That cannot be done" and you'll do it.

What aspiring clerk has not been thrilled to read

Promotion comes to him who tries
Not solely for a selfish prize,
But day by day and year by year
Holds his employer's interests dear.

On the Fourth of July he sings the sentiments

That all men picture when they see
The glorious banner of the free.

Guest's *Harbor Lights of Home* is dedicated to "The best friends, the best neighbors, the best citizens in the world, the home folks." According to the Reverend M. S. Rice, of Detroit, who won the title prize, "Edgar A. Guest is in my judgment the finest force in America today in defense of the home."

Since the war American readers have turned to philosophy and history. The number of non-fiction books which run into the hundred thousand class is amazing. Consider the popularity of Wells's *Outline of History*, Will Durant's *Story of Philosophy*, Van Loon's *Story of Mankind*, Robinson's *Mind in the Making*, Dorsey's *Why We Behave Like Human Beings*, to say nothing of Ludwig's *Napoleon*, Hackett's *Henry VIII*, and Strachey's *Queen Victoria* and *Elizabeth and Essex*. Who can measure their effect upon the public mind? Pessimists see in this tendency merely the triumph of super-salesmanship, whereas optimists regard it

as evidence of an awakened curiosity and a sincere desire for understanding. Certainly they ought to promote a consciousness of the transitory nature of customs and morals.

With the growth of American prosperity has come a yearning for social polish. So drilled are we in the Baconian belief that knowledge is power that we thirst for books which will open our minds to its treasures. But scholarship is tedious and time is fleeting, so the American characteristically seeks a short cut. Does this explain the popularity of the numerous outlines with which the book market has been drenched? We want culture, but in concentrated form. Publishers do not hesitate to fill the demand. Fifteen minutes a day, they say, will acquaint you with the master minds of all time. Elbert Hubbard's *Scrap Book*, containing the "best thought of all the ages" in one volume, becomes a guidebook for the gullible. Success in love, business, and politics is promised to all who will read as they run.

This searching for light helps to explain the numerous book clubs. Through them hundreds of thousands each month read the same book, hot from the presses. With a few exceptions their selections have been of singularly high quality when one considers that theirs is a mass appeal. Who would have believed that a hundred thousand Americans could be brought to purchase an *Anthology of World Poetry* or Walter Lippmann's *Preface to Morals* or Stephen Vincent Benét's long narrative poem *John Brown's Body*? If these clubs continue to send out such books and continue to grow, it will no longer be possible to point to America as a land of morons and moujiks who cannot appreciate literature more serious than *Bertha, the Sewing Machine Girl* or *Riders of the Purple Sage*. The power and responsibility which these clubs have is great. May they use it well!

Chapter IX

CENSORSHIP AND DEMOCRACY

"I have sworn upon the altar of the living God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man," said Thomas Jefferson. A thousand sermons might be preached upon such a text. Democratic government rests upon the twin rights of association and advocacy. When freedom of expression is restricted, democracy dies in dictatorship.

"Whoever has power has liberty," says Leon Whipple — but no group can peaceably achieve power without liberty.

Those who sit in the seats of power have ever sought to suppress those who opposed their rule. The modern doctrine of liberty grew out of the religious struggles of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The soil of early Christianity was watered with the blood of martyrs who dared to die for their beliefs. But once Christianity became the official religion and Christians sat on the judgment seat, they in turn sought to suppress those who differed from them. The history of the medieval Church is the story of a striving for unity through forcible conversion and suppression.

But intolerance breeds rebellion, and it was not long until Luther, Calvin, and Zwingli raised the standard of revolt against the withering rule of Rome. Yet once again the old tale was repeated. When Protestantism was a minor sect

fighting against intrenched authority, its battle cry was liberty. Tolerance is always the plea of the oppressed. "No law can be imposed upon Christians by any authority whatsoever . . . without their own consent," declared Luther. And again he emphasized the futility of force where ideas are concerned. "Heresy," he said, "can never be contained by force. . . . God's Word must do the fighting here. . . . Though we should burn every Jew and heretic by force, yet neither were there nor will there be one conquered or converted thereby." But when Protestantism had come to power, Luther turned on the peasants, whom his teachings had inspired to revolt, with unbridled ferocity. On May 4, 1525, he wrote: "Let all who are able hew them down, slaughter and stab them, openly or in secret, and remember that there is nothing more poisonous, noxious, and utterly diabolical than a rebel."

The American Pilgrim fathers, we are told, sought in the New World freedom to worship God according to their own consciences. Yet in the theocracy which they established, only those who worshiped after the approved fashion were tolerated. Everyone is familiar with the persecutions of Roger Williams, Anne Hutchinson, and the Quakers. "No person should be persecuted for . . . [his] conscience," said Cotton Mather, "if he is meek and makes no show of his heresy. *But if a person is warned and then follows a misinformed conscience, he may be forced to reform by the state.*" [Italics mine.] Liberty to believe what we are told to believe is merely tyranny by another name. The "free" state which the Puritans established in New England was in fact a "close-knit church-state, with authority reserved to the aristocracy of Christian talent." Freedom of conscience

has never been a principle of religious groups when they have been able to exercise coercion. Toleration and freedom of belief are secure only where there are a number of contending groups of substantially equal power.

The growth of rival sects in America has worked for toleration. The first amendment to the Constitution provides that "Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech or of the Press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the government for a redress of grievances." This provision in substance has been repeated in our state constitutions.

True religious liberty should extend to all, whatever their belief or disbelief. Yet atheists have never enjoyed complete freedom to advocate their doctrines in America. In 1811, in the case of People *versus* Ruggles, Chancellor Kent observed:

> The people of this state [New York], in common with the people of this country, profess the general doctrines of Christianity . . . and to scandalize the Author of these doctrines is not only . . . extremely impious, but even . . . gross violation of decency and good order. . . . Nor are we bound by any expressions in the Constitution . . . to punish . . . like attacks upon the religion of Mahomet or the Great Lama; for this plain reason, that . . . we are a Christian people, and the morality of the country is based upon Christianity, and not upon the doctrines or worship of these impostors.

In other words, complete religious liberty in the United States extends only to Christians. This doctrine has received repeated affirmations.

In 1852 the Mormon Church proclaimed plural marriage

as one of the tenets of its faith, and in 1862 Congress made polygamy a crime. The law was sustained by the Supreme Court on the ground that the guarantees of religious liberty in the Constitution do not extend to acts which are offensive to society. Or, as the New York courts put it, "No man can be permitted to set up his religious belief as a defense to the commission of an act which is in plain violation of the law of the state." According to the Supreme Court, religion has only to do with man's relations to "an extramundane being." In so far as it governs a man's earthly life, it must conform to existing habit-patterns. The time may come when Christian Scientists or Catholics will be deprived of the right to worship after their own fashion because failure to employ medical aid or the conduct of confessionals and nunneries and the practice of celibacy may be deemed against public order. Already parochial schools have been the object of legislative attack.

Nor are blasphemy trials things of the past. In 1926 one Anthony Bimba was arrested in Brockton, Massachusetts, under a statute of 1782 which makes it a crime for "any person willfully . . . [to] blaspheme the holy name of God." Two years later Charles Smith, president of the American Association for the Advancement of Atheism, was arrested and fined in Little Rock, Arkansas, for violating a local ordinance prohibiting the use of the name of the deity except in "veneration and worship." Smith's offense consisted in having in his possession a placard which proclaimed: "Evolution is true. The Bible is a lie. God's a Ghost." Since the laws of Arkansas prohibit atheists from testifying in court, Smith was denied the right to testify in his own behalf. The anti-evolution laws of Tennessee and

Mississippi are of a piece with this form of religious intolerance. They are based on the assumption that evolution is inconsistent with revealed religion. Books on evolution have been publicly burned in Mississippi.

The American Revolution was a struggle for political liberty and independence — for the right of every man to an equal voice in the control of the state. At least so the history texts teach. But these revolutionists were "practical" statesmen, and they did not take too seriously the ringing phrases of the Declaration of Independence about liberty and equality. When they had mounted the saddle and held the reins, they ceased to be the persecuted and became the persecutors. There was to be no toleration for Tories. Eight of the thirteen states passed laws against them, and in Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Virginia, criticism of Congress and the state assemblies was made a crime.

Within ten years of the adoption of the first amendment, Congress enacted the infamous Alien and Sedition Acts, making it a crime to publish attacks upon any branch of the Federal government. "The primary purpose of the Acts," says Hannis Taylor, "was to advance the interests of the party in power by restraining the freedom of speech and of the Press." The Jeffersonians fumed against these laws, Jefferson himself preparing the resolutions adopted in Virginia declaring them null and void. One of his first acts as President was to bring about their repeal and to pardon those who had been imprisoned.

Personal rights have always suffered in war time. During the Civil War, newspapers were censored and suppressed, editors were imprisoned, and speakers sent to jail for

criticizing the government. "Must I shoot a simple-minded soldier who deserts," asked Lincoln, "while I must not touch a hair of the wily agitator who induces him to desert?" During the World War, the restrictions were even more severe. Under the Espionage Act of 1917 and the Sedition Act of 1918, penalties were laid upon the expression not only of opinions calculated to interfere with the successful operation of the military and naval forces, but also of those which were "disloyal, profane, scurrilous, or abusive" of the government and its constituted officials. Under these laws over nineteen hundred prosecutions took place. Individuals were arrested and newspapers were suppressed for demanding their repeal, for advocating a referendum on war, for arguing in favor of heavy taxation to support the war, for criticizing the knitting craze, and even for reading portions of the New Testament and the Declaration of Independence.

Notwithstanding the fact that the courts uphold the fiction that the Constitution operates in time of war as in peace, they have sustained these Acts. "When a nation is at war," said Justice Holmes, "many things which might be said in time of peace are such a hindrance to its efforts that their utterance will not be endured so long as men fight, and the Court could not regard them as protected by any Constitutional right." Or as one Federal judge declared during the trial of Rose Pastor Stokes for denouncing the President's failure to check profiteering: "The President could not stop in the face of the enemy and effect domestic reforms. We do not ordinarily clean house and hang out the bedding when there is a thunderstorm on." We ought at least to be honest with ourselves and admit that in time

of war Constitutional guarantees are for practical purposes — dead.

Whatever may be the justification for suppression of fundamental rights during war time, it is intolerable in time of peace. Yet following the war the United States Department of Justice embarked upon a campaign of repression without precedent in our history. The great "Red" dragnet in the hands of A. Mitchell Palmer and his brood of spies seized hundreds of citizens and sent them to jail for offenses no more serious than wearing a red necktie or singing a revolutionary song. In many cases every vestige of justice vanished and the trials became merely halfway houses to the penitentiary. All the evils of illegal searches and seizures, imprisonment without bail, bail when allowed so excessive as to be oppressive, trumped-up evidence, and unadulterated brutality, were applied. Special agents were employed to organize radical meetings which other agents promptly raided. All so-called radicals looked alike, and those without wealth and influence were given short shrift. To read the *Report on Illegal Practices of the United States Department of Justice* issued by the National Popular Government League and signed by many of the country's leading lawyers, is to marvel that in the "land of the free" such things can take place. Constitutional protections went by the board, and force and fraud, the familiar instruments of tyrants, were freely used. So outrageous was the conduct of public officials during and after the war that Charles Evans Hughes declared: "We may well wonder, in view of the precedents now established, whether constitutional government as heretofore maintained in this republic could survive another great war even if victoriously waged."

But the Federal government was not alone. Twenty-six

states have laws against criminal syndicalism which make it an offense to advocate a change in our form of government even in time of peace. In many of them it is not necessary to advocate violent revolution to come under the ban. It is enough if language is used "calculated to bring the form of government of the United States, its military forces [etc.] . . . into contempt." Nor do they stop at this. They outlaw sabotage and the advocacy of sabotage. The Idaho law upon which many other states have modeled their own legislation includes in the definition of sabotage: "(1) Work done in an improper manner; (2) improper use of materials; (3) loitering at work; (4) slack work." Obviously such laws are not directed against lawyers, ministers, and bankers but are intended only for laborers.

In California it is a crime even to belong to the I. W. W. or the Communist Party, and this statute was sustained in 1927 by the United States Supreme Court. In Sacramento County two members of the I. W. W. were put on trial in 1922. The defense called ten fellow members of the organization to prove that the I. W. W. did not advocate force and violence. All ten were immediately arrested as members of an outlaw organization, and in 1923 all were convicted and sent to prison for terms ranging from one to fourteen years. Nor were these exceptionally heavy sentences. In six states a sentence of twenty years may be imposed and in South Dakota twenty-five, the average for all the states being about ten years.

"The truth is," says William Seagle, "that we are rapidly approaching, if we have not already reached, the bankruptcy of constitutionalism. The doctrine of fundamental rights, after a century and a half, is in rapid decay."

In so far as these laws prohibit the advocacy of violence

and crime, they are unnecessary, since these offenses are already covered by ordinary criminal law. In so far as they outlaw criticism of the government, sabotage, or even advocacy of revolution, they have no place in a nation which calls itself "free."

"Taxation without representation is tyranny," shouted the American rebels of 1776. If it was tyranny then, it is no less so today. In 1918 a socialist, Victor Berger, was elected to Congress from the fifth district of Wisconsin. He had vigorously opposed the war in his speeches and his paper, the Milwaukee *Leader*. Shortly after his election he was tried under the Sedition Act and found guilty of obstructing and embarrassing the government. When he came to take his seat in Congress he was denied admission. A special election was ordered to fill the vacancy, and Berger was reëlected with an increased majority. He was again excluded. "The chairman of the committee which reported against him," says Charles Beard, "did not rest his case on the ground that Mr. Berger had been convicted of a crime. On the contrary, he said: 'The one and only issue in this case is that of Americanism.' " Only six representatives voted to seat Berger. Floor-Manager James R. Mann, one of the six, was indignant: "To me the question is whether we shall maintain inviolate the representative form of government. . . . I do not share the views of Mr. Berger, but I am willing to meet his views in an argument before the people rather than to say we shall deny him the opportunity to be heard when elected by the people in the legal form and invite them, in effect, to resort to violence." Upon his second exclusion, Berger was renominated, but the governor of the state declined to hold another special election, and the

people of the fifth Congressional district of Wisconsin went unrepresented.

In January, 1920, five duly elected socialist members of the New York assembly, after having taken the customary oath to support the Constitution, were ejected. By this act sixty thousand voters in the city of New York were disfranchised. Former Governor Charles Evans Hughes promptly wrote Speaker Sweet, of the assembly, as follows:

> If there was anything against these men as individuals, if they were deemed guilty of criminal offenses, they should have been charged accordingly. But I understand that the action is not directed against these five elected members as individuals, but that the proceeding is virtually an attempt to indict a political party and to deny it representation in the legislature. This is not, in my judgment, American government.

It should be noted that this took place over a year after the Armistice. "Taxation without representation is tyranny!"

Recently the United States Senate ratified the Kellogg Peace Treaty renouncing war as an instrument of national policy. It would seem that at last opposition to war had become respectable. Not so in the United States! Rosika Schwimmer, noted social worker and pacifist, has but recently been denied citizenship because she does not believe in war and said that she would not bear arms in defense of this country. She did not say she would oppose the United states by word or deed, but said merely that she would not kill in its defense. In his dissenting opinion Justice Holmes remarked:

> . . . the applicant seems to be a woman of superior character and intelligence, obviously more than ordinarily desirable as a citizen of the United States. . . . So far as the adequacy of her

oath [of allegiance] is concerned, I hardly see how that is affected . . . inasmuch as she is a woman over fifty years of age and would not be allowed to bear arms if she wanted to. . . . Some of her answers might excite popular prejudice, *but if there is any principle of the Constitution that more imperatively calls for attachment than any other, it is the principle of free thought — not free thought for those who agree with us, but freedom of thought for thought we hate.* [Italics mine.]

Similarly Professor D. C. MacIntosh, of the Yale Divinity School, in applying for citizenship was asked if he would take up arms in defense of the United States. Replying to the question, he said: "I do not undertake to support my country right or wrong, in any dispute which may arise, and I am not willing to promise beforehand, and without knowing the cause for which my country may go to war, either that I will or that I will not take up arms in defense of this country, however necessary war may seem to the government of the day." His application was denied.* Here we have official declaration that to become a citizen of the United States one must subscribe to the formula of "my country right or wrong." It literally says that the strength of the United States rests not upon its reputation for honesty and fair dealing but upon brute force, and this in spite of the provisions of the Kellogg Pact.

A free Press is one of the firmest bulwarks of free government. In the Federal Constitution and in the constitutions of the states this principle is recognized. The Press, like the ordinary citizen, must be subject to the criminal law and the laws against malicious libel — but within these limits it must be completely free to publish news, comment, and criticism, however much it may offend the "powers that

* It is gratifying to record that this decision was reversed by the United States Circuit Court of Appeals, June 30, 1930.

be." Newspapers, as individuals, suffer the limitations inevitably incident to war, and it would be useless to relate here the numerous instances of such suppression. Since the trials of Peter Zenger in 1734 and Croswell in 1804 the principle of a free Press in times of peace has become firmly established. On the whole we have good reason to congratulate ourselves in this respect.

Through the Press the citizen can keep an eye on his government. Under the burning light of "pitiless publicity" representatives watch their steps. The right to report Congressional proceedings, although at first not allowed, was by 1795 clearly recognized, and reporters by 1841 were freely admitted to both Houses of Congress.

Some limitations, however, persist. The United States Senate has always been skittish on the reporting of executive or secret sessions. Early in 1929 a reporter of the United Press sent to his newspaper the roll call vote on the confirmation of ex-Senator Lenroot of Wisconsin as a judge of the Court of Customs Appeals. On these "lame duck" appointments Senators are touchy, and the publication of the roll call occasioned an outburst of indignation among the old guard. The offending reporter was called before the rules committee and asked from whom he obtained this information. He declined to answer. For this breach of Senate secrecy the representatives of the Press were temporarily denied the privilege of the floor. The net result of the affair was a thorough airing of the whole matter of secret sessions, and there are pending a number of resolutions requiring that roll call votes in executive session be hereafter published. There are occasions when the publication of debates on appointments and treaties would serve no good purpose and might result in unnecessary embarrass-

ment, but it would seem an elementary requirement of representative government that the people should know how their representatives vote on the final disposition of such matters.

A similar incident occurred recently in Nebraska. A reporter of the Lincoln *State Journal* published the roll call vote of a secret session of the state senate. A committee was at once appointed to investigate the "leak." Before the investigation had got under way the newspapers of the state began a vigorous and united campaign against all secret sessions, and in April, 1929, they were abolished. The investigation of the "leak" had petered out and in a burst of irony was finally referred to the "statehouse plumber."

A more serious attack upon the Press is embodied in the Minnesota law granting power to the courts to issue injunctions suppressing any newspaper which "regularly publishes malicious, scandalous, and defamatory matter." The newspaper men of the state and nation are up in arms against the law. Its constitutionality is by no means clear and is even now being tested in the courts. No one can object to censorship of malicious, scandalous, or defamatory matter. But these words can be interpreted to mean anything from criticism of the way in which the governor wears his hat to advocacy of bloodshed and murder. One is reminded of Walter Bagehot's remark: "No one knows what blasphemy is or what sedition is, but all know that they are vague words which can be fitted to any meaning that shall please the ruling powers."

Whether some limitation should be placed upon the publication of divorce and crime news remains a moot question. A Mississippi judge in 1926 ordered the newspapers having

a circulation in his district to refrain from printing the testimony in a murder trial. His right to do this, he said, derived from no law but from the "inherent power of the court." In England newspapers are forbidden to report divorce cases beyond giving an account of the judge's statement. Dr. John Cunliffe, of the Columbia School of Journalism, proposes that some such plan be adopted here with reference to crime news. But here again it becomes necessary to make distinctions and exceptions. To give this power to the judge might work well in the Snyder-Gray murder trial under Judge Scudder, but could the same be said of the Sacco-Vanzetti case with Roscoe Thayer on the bench?

Through his power to exclude certain matter from the mails, the Postmaster General may exercise a stringent censorship. Prior to 1860, although there was no law authorizing it, abolitionist propaganda was systematically barred, and during the Civil War pro-Southern papers were excluded. This form of censorship was later legalized by statutes passed in 1865 and the years following. The most famous of these is the so-called "Comstock Law" of 1873, which provides that:

> Every obscene, lewd, or lascivious, and every filthy book, painting, picture, paper, letter, writing, or print, or other publication of an indecent character . . . and every article or thing designed for . . . preventing conception or producing abortion . . . or the giving of information directly or indirectly, where or how or from whom or by what means any of these articles can be obtained, is a crime.

Congress amended this Act in 1909 to include under the term "indecent" all "matter of a character tending to incite

arson, murder, or assassination." Under the Espionage and Sedition Acts this power was further extended and the Postmaster General given authority to exclude all matter which was disloyal, profane, or abusive, or which was intended to cause contempt or scorn of the government of the United States. Under these laws numerous radical publications have been denied the privilege of the mails, which in many cases is equivalent to complete suppression. The danger of such procedure is increased when one recalls that the findings of the postal authorities are for the most part final and are not ordinarily subject to judicial review.

In spite of the foregoing limitations, when compared to the Press in Italy, Russia, and Spain, ours is as free as the air.

The Comstock Law cited above is not the only protection we have against immoral influences. As early as 1842 the customs authorities were required to refuse admission to obscene books, and in 1888 obscene letters were barred from the mails. The immigration officials too have power to keep the land of Hollywood and Broadway free from the contaminating influence of persons guilty of moral turpitude. In a single year over two hundred persons were thus denied entry, among them the notorious Countess Cathcart.

The Comstock Law served as a model for the New York Act which prohibits all books or periodicals which are "obscene, lewd, lascivious, filthy, indecent, or disgusting." In Massachusetts all books are banned which contain "obscene, indecent, or impure language, or language manifestly tending to corrupt the morals of youth." In 1907 North Dakota penalized the using of indecent language over the telephone, and Texas has recently followed with a simi-

lar statute. Kansas, Arkansas, and South Dakota have laws to protect their citizens from Lady Nicotine in the form of cigarettes. It is illegal to smoke in public restaurants in Nebraska, Idaho, and North Dakota, and in the latter state cigarettes may not be advertised. In Idaho it is possible to smoke in a public restaurant provided one repairs to the toilet rooms. There are regulations of dance halls, pool rooms, carnivals, and circuses. A Kentucky statute of 1922 prohibits "the appearance of persons clothed only in bathing costumes upon the public highways of this Commonwealth or upon the streets of towns and villages having no police protection." Three states have Peeping Tom Acts for the benefit presumably of ladies who neglect their window shades. The Georgia Act wisely makes an exception for officers of the law. "There are numerous laws," says William Seagle, "against making obscene marks or drawings on water closets. . . . In Idaho there is a recent law against joy riding. . . . In Louisiana there is a law against unauthorized persons entering the premises of state schools where dormitories for women are maintained. Another state contributes a statute making it unlawful to hang or exhibit paintings of the nude "except in an art gallery"! In Mississippi no publication may be sold which has been excluded from the United States mails because of its vulgar, indecent, or obscene character. In Minnesota anyone having in his possession for purposes of sale or circulation "an obscene, lewd, and lascivious newspaper, magazine, or other periodical" may be arrested and imprisoned for committing a nuisance.

Anthony Comstock, moving spirit in the organization in 1873 of the New York Society for the Suppression of Vice,

has left an indelible mark upon the legislation and thought of the nation. It was he who directly or indirectly inspired the organization of similar societies throughout the country. This doughty crusader for purity, this "roundsman of the Lord," was instrumental in bringing 3,648 prosecutions and obtaining 2,682 convictions. He secured the destruction of fifty tons of books, over 28,000 pounds of stereotype plates, almost 17,000 photographic negatives, and 3,984,063 photographs. The work which he began has been carried on since 1915 by John S. Sumner, the present head of the vice society. His record since 1920, as given in an article by Henry Pringle, follows:

Year	*Arrests*	*Convictions — Pleas of Guilty*	*Percentage of Convictions*
1920	184	150	81
1921	120	94	78
1922	64	57	89
1923	34	19	55
1924	32	14	43
1925	41	21	51

Apparently there has been a let-down in the vigor of the organization, since it cannot be argued that the amount of vice has decreased.

The sources of immoral infection are insidious and numerous. They include pictures of all kinds, statues, magazines, and newspapers — but books are among the worst. For those who would know the effort expended in keeping our literature pure, there is no better source than Morris Ernst and William Seagle's *To the Pure: A Study of Obscenity and the Censor.*

Almost any mention of sex is taboo, and to suggest illicit love is to ally oneself with the powers of evil. In New York,

Cabell's *Jurgen*, Schnitzler's *Casanova's Homecoming*, Lawrence's *Women in Love*, and Gautier's *Mademoiselle de Maupin* have been attacked. But New York is an author's paradise compared with Boston, where over a hundred books are on the list of the condemned.

The censors labor under considerable difficulty, since the authorities often work at cross purposes. For instance, the customs authorities admit Dr. Marie Stopes's *Married Love*, but it cannot be sent through the mails. *The Woman's Journal*, of Boston, was excluded from the mails for printing an agricultural report issued by the Department of Agriculture, and in September, 1911, the report of the Chicago Vice Commission, destined for ministers and reformers, was barred. In several instances pamphlets have been thrown out which were collections of Bible quotations. The Good Book, being a book of life, is full of obscene words and phrases and lewd and lascivious descriptions, as any adolescent can testify. And yet the American Bible Society has sent out over 194,000,000 copies. Perhaps the prize should go to the customs officers who in 1909 attempted to prevent the importation by the Field Museum, of Chicago, of certain Chinese manuscripts and pictures.

The fact that a book is an ancient classic is no protection. The *Satyricon* of Petronius, *The Love Books* of Ovid, *The Thousand and One Arabian Nights* are all interdicted. In May, 1929, Voltaire's *Candide* was barred at the port of Boston, and a rare 1750 edition of Rabelais was seized — to be consigned to the flames.

It is not surprising to find on the Boston catalogue of horrors such books as Ben Lindsey's *Revolt of Modern Youth*, Lewis's *Elmer Gantry*, and Frances Newman's *The Hard*

Boiled Virgin. But when one discovers on the list *The World of William Clissold*, by H. G. Wells, and *What I Believe*, by Bertrand Russell, one finds it difficult to understand the working of the censor's mind. Even that incorrigible evangelist and "prize prude," Upton Sinclair, finds his novel *Oil* banned because he portrays the insipidity and shallowness of "petting" and illicit love. Out of 527 pages in the book, the censors object to nine. But it is enough! Concerning the man who complained to the police about *Oil*, a Boston clergyman said: "I have suppressed two reports damaging to his moral character." *Honi soit qui mal y pense* — evil be to him who evil thinks.

Immorality is not a fixed thing — it changes with the times. In 1908 the publisher of Elinor Glyn's *Three Weeks* was convicted in Boston, but in 1925 the secretary of the New England Watch and Ward Society said: "Do you know, I couldn't get a conviction against that book nowadays. I wouldn't dare take it into court."

Curiously enough these anti-vice societies have made little effort to discover just where people get their sexual information and what things are most stimulating to their carnal passions. This study has been left to more profane persons. Katherine Davis, for instance, found that out of over a thousand women examined, the overwhelming majority received their earliest sex information not from books but from parents, guardians, and other children, with the last source in the lead. Only seventy-two admitted the influence of books and pamphlets, and the leading written sources were the Bible, the dictionary, and the encyclopedia. Why have the censors neglected these? As to what things were sexually stimulating, the largest number said "man,"

and only a paltry few admitted books, dancing, and the drama. Sixty-four admitted that nothing stimulated them.

The mere mention of birth control makes the censor pale with rage. The Sunday edition of the New York *Call*, a socialist daily, was excluded from the mails in 1913 for printing articles on "What Every Girl Should Know." *The Birth Control Review* has time and again felt the censor's axe. "Holy smoke!" says the Boston inspector, reading *Oil*. "Here this guy has a girl say that she knows how to keep from having babies!" In their campaign against this literature, the censors have the hearty coöperation of the Catholic hierarchy. It is significant that Boston is 70 per cent Catholic. The New York hierarchy has succeeded on several occasions in suppressing birth control meetings and exhibits.

In 1918 Mrs. Mary Ware Dennett prepared a pamphlet, *The Sex Side of Life*, for the instruction of her two sons, aged eleven and fourteen. It had later been published in the *Medical Review of Reviews*, had received the endorsement of over four hundred leading clergymen, educators, and physicians, and had been used in Y.M.C.A classes, in private schools, and even by many churches. In 1929 Mrs. Dennett was indicted for sending filthy and obscene matter through the mails. She came to trial in a Brooklyn Federal court on January 28, 1929. Assistant United States Attorney James Wilkinson, in charge of the prosecution, denounced the pamphlet as "filth" and "sewerage." So typical is his argument of the censor's viewpoint that it is worth quoting at some length.

> The sober duty devolves upon this court of protecting the young from this idea of sex which pervades the world today. There is no mention of chastity in this vile pamphlet. Chastity!

Let us remember the Roman senator who, in far-off pagan times, struck his daughter dead when he learned of her unchastity!

And the author of this pamphlet even suggests that birth control will eventually be practiced. Birth control! — hitting at the very foundation of government! . . . What will happen to America if our national standard falls so low, I ask? Where will our soldiers come from in our hour of need? God help America if we haven't men to defend her in that hour! . . .

There's nothing here about the mighty stars and spaces, nothing about the flowers, the Savior, about music, poetry, and literature. Why, sir, I am the father of four daughters. But I'd never think of allowing even my twenty-two-year-old daughter, who is a school-teacher, to lay hand on such filth as this!

Would you trust a sixteen-year-old boy or girl in a room alone at night reading this book? Let me read you what the author finally says: "When two people love each other, they don't care who knows it. They are proud of their happiness."

And then came the final touch, delivered with the solemnity of a priest administering extreme unction: "Where does the institution of home and family come off if we let a gospel like that go out to the world? . . . And suppose it falls into the hands of an abnormally-minded boy. Why, the first thing he will do will be to waylay a beautiful girl . . . and . . . attack her!"

In vain did Morris Ernst, Mrs. Dennett's counsel, say: "If you deny this distribution, then you are sending children back to the gutter for their information. . . . I say no one is too young to receive the true facts in a healthy way, when you consider other sources of information. . . . This pamphlet is not obscene. Its motive is clean and healthy. . . . Obscenity is a subjective thing. It exists in the minds of dirty vice-hunters who are always looking for

dirt. They can always find it, because it is a subjective thing."

Mrs. Dennett was found guilty and sentenced to pay a fine of $300.*

From time to time the legitimate stage feels the harsh hand of the censor. In New York such plays as *Sex, The Captive, A Good Bad Woman, The Virgin Man,* and *Maya* have been raided by the police and the cast led off to jail. It is not only the producers and players who suffer. In New York the commissioner of licenses has power to padlock for a year the theater in which such a play has been showing. Such proceedings remind one of the savage custom of burning the twig that trips us. Eugene O'Neill's *Desire under the Elms* was stopped in Los Angeles and the cast arrested. After a special performance for their benefit, the jurors were unable to agree and the players were released. Almost immediately, as is common in such cases, the play began running to capacity houses.

It is somewhat ironical that the New York *World,* staunch defender of liberty where prohibition is concerned, should be in the vanguard of those who demand theatrical censorship. "The line must be drawn somewhere," says this great libertarian journal. But where? Are modern playwrights to have the same latitude as Shakspere or must they conform to the narrow principles of the Wilkinsons and the Sumners? If *What Price Glory* or *Desire under the Elms* is obscene, how about Congreve's *Way of the World* and Shakspere's *Macbeth, Othello,* or *Hamlet.* What is obscene anyway? Is no play to be allowed which inspires immoral

* I am happy to record that on March 3, 1930, this decision was reversed by the Circuit Court of Appeals.

thoughts in the audience? If so, what plays will not inspire such thoughts in some people? How many must be so inspired before a play is immoral? Are musical comedies and revues to be subject to the same standards as ordinary drama? A visit to Ziegfeld's revues, "glorifying the American girl," will, we venture to believe, arouse more lewd thoughts than most so-called immoral dramas. Yet there has been practically no attempt to censor them. One is forced to conclude that what the censors object to is not immorality but heresy, the exposure of current hypocrisies and shams. If the play has no ideas, if it is merely a song and dance, there is no objection. But once let the author launch upon social criticism and the censor's axe is raised.

The *World* suggests a voluntary play jury to act as censor. But who is to compose such a jury? Is it to be made up of professional critics whose moral sense is admittedly callous, or is it to be recruited from the ranks of reformers and clergymen? A play may not affect the members of the jury as it will affect the general public. Are we then to say with an officer of the Daughters of the American Revolution when confronted with the prospect of having that highly "immoral" play, *Rain*, presented in her home town?

> We do not fear the effect which such a play would have on us. We of the D.A.R. and the United Daughters of the Confederacy have had the advantages of education and travel and have been prepared for such things. . . .
>
> But there are other women who have not had these advantages, and there are young people who are inexperienced in the problems of life. It is for their benefit and protection that we seek to prevent the showing of such plays in Knoxville.
>
> Such a play would not injure me, but I have seen the world. Nobody knows the world better than I.

Just how much travel and education is necessary before one is able to withstand the seductions and blandishments of the stage? The writer can see no open road out of these perplexities short of complete freedom on the stage as in the Press. We cannot solve the problem by putting the public into anybody's moral strait-jacket. Once the principle of censorship is admitted, it becomes increasingly difficult to know just where to stop. Practically all people who advocate censorship are like the lady of the D.A.R., sure that they are themselves immune but equally positive that somebody else will be infected. Their kindly altruism we admire; their judgment and methods we deplore. The suppression of freedom in behalf of faith has ever proved fatal to both.

Many people who resent any censorship of the Press, stage, or literature, are quite willing to subject the movies to some such control. Their argument is a not unreasonable one, since the movies reach millions where books and plays reach at most a few hundred thousand.

Film censorship has been attempted in thirty states, has been adopted in six, and there is a persistent demand for Federal censorship. At the present time, aside from Will Hays, national censorship is exercised by the National Board of Review. But this is a voluntary organization coöperating with the producers and has no legal power to enforce its recommendations. The board is actively opposed to legal censorship, its own slogan being "Selection, not censorship." *

Already the movies are subject to the Comstock Law, and

* Mention should be made in this connection of the voluntary censorship imposed by the Movie Chamber of Commerce established in 1922. For example, this organization refused to allow the filming of Dreiser's *American Tragedy*, although the producers had paid $90,000 for the film

in 1913 Congress made it unlawful to send prize fight films in interstate commerce. A number of bills have been introduced in Congress providing for Federal censorship. By far the most thoroughgoing of these is that sponsored by Canon William S. Chase and the New York Civic League. This bill would proscribe "bathroom and bedroom scenes," "passionate love," "scenes making prominent an illicit love affair," "white slavery," "nakedness or persons scantily dressed," "scenes concerned with the underworld unless part of an essential conflict between good and evil," "scenes which make drunkenness and gambling attractive," "which show the use of narcotics," "methods of committing crime," "scenes which ridicule or deprecate public officials . . . or which tend to weaken the authority of the law," "stories which offend the religious beliefs of any person, creed, or sect, or ridicule ministers, priests, rabbis, or other recognized leaders of any religious sect," "which unduly emphasize bloodshed," "scenes which are vulgar and portray improper gestures," and those "with salacious titles." The foregoing list was not taken from Canon Chase's imagination but from the National Association of the Motion Picture Industry, which claims to represent 95 per cent of the producers. Indeed, these are the standards by which the movies are supposed to be now governed. A visit to the nearest picture house will show how effectively they are being applied.

Let us take a look at the way in which state censorship has worked. The New York Moving Picture Commission is directed to refuse a license to any picture which is "obscene, indecent, immoral, inhuman, sacrilegious, or of such a char-

rights. It was objected to on the ground that such a picture would be too sordid for the American public. See "Free Speech for Talkies," by E. W. Hullinger, *North American Review*, June, 1929.

acter that its exhibition would tend to corrupt morals or incite to crime." The laws in the other states are similar. In 1922 the New York Commission ordered the elimination of 2,968 scenes from 861 films, and 72 were suppressed in toto. In 1928 over 4,000 eliminations were ordered from 661 films, and 1,964 films were approved without eliminations. Over half the eliminations were on the ground of "tending to incite to crime," and some 1,300 passages were condemned as "indecent" or "inhuman."

It is interesting to see just how the censors have interpreted such words as "indecent," "obscene," or "tending to incite to crime." When a nurse in *The Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse* announced to a feverishly anxious expectant grandfather, "It's a boy!" the censors ordered the title changed to "The boy is better"; the first was immoral. You must not show an expectant mother sewing baby clothes, as in *Way Down East*, for that is indecent. A similar scene was ordered eliminated from *Brother Officers*, and the censor explained: "The average child believes a stork brings the baby. We can't disillusion the child." Said the patron to his bootlegger, "Bootlegging must be good business." "Aw," said the booze-peddler, "it ain't the coin that counts so much wid me, lady. It's the people youse meet." Out with it, say the censors; incites to crime. "Will you drink your hair tonic here or take it home," flashes from the screen. Eliminate it; promotes crime. In *Lost a Wife* two close-ups of a roulette wheel were cut out for the same reason. "This hurts me more than it does you," said the movie father, spanking his child. "Yes," said the infant, "but not in the same place." Indecent! shout the censors, and out it goes.

In a Harold Lloyd comedy, during a fraternity initiation,

Harold is hit over the head with a huge rubber hammer which bounces off as from ivory. This scene was ordered eliminated as inhuman. In the comedy *Good Riddance* a dog-owner hires an aviator to "lose" his dog in the sky. At thirty-five thousand feet the dog is dropped, only to land, hale and happy, in the back seat of his master's car. Actually, of course the dog dropped but two or three feet in the studio. The scene was ordered eliminated as showing cruelty to animals.

The picture *Nice People* was barred from Kansas for showing women smoking cigarettes. In Pennsylvania, cheek to cheek dancing, permitted in every dance hall, must not be shown on the screen. Neither can "prenatal or childbed scenes," "pictures including themes and incidents having to do with eugenics, birth control, race suicide." The Pennsylvania board does not object to smoking women as such, but such smoking must not be "suggestive." Just what is "suggestive" smoking?

The following scenes were ordered eliminated from *Mannequin*: ". . . views of man carrying girl face downward under his arm and of the other man pouring cocktail in her mouth while she is held in this posture and views of her being dropped to floor afterward and lying there with dress above her knees. Indecent; would incite to crime (liquor); needless exhibition of women's underclothing." *

One is inclined to be suspicious of these censors. People tend to read into the words and acts of others their own pre-

* Standards of decency vary from state to state. *Carmen* was rejected in three different states for three different reasons. This led Channing Pollock, the playwright, to remark: "Considering that it is forty years since first she mouthed her love to the music of Bizet, Carmen might have expected the deference due old age. Beautifully filmed and beautifully acted by Geraldine Farrar, she came as a bolt from the blue to shocked

dilections and prejudices. As Morris Ernst says, obscenity is a subjective thing. Are the censors right in assuming that all people are so depraved that they cannot hold their primitive impulses in check but must have a guardian to protect them from immoral stimuli? Is there not an unwarranted presumption on the part of the censors that they know better than the public what is good for us? Even Canon Chase admits that in the long run "people do not want to see immoral pictures . . . [that] in the end filth disgusts and repels the crowd." Why not then let the crowd do its own censoring?*

But these forces will corrupt the youth, they say. Are we then to reduce the arts to the level of the kindergarten for the artists to avoid the penitentiary? By all means let us

---

and surprised boards in Ohio, Pennsylvania, and California. Her ancient kiss was cut to five feet. . . . All love scenes showing embraces between males and females were ordered measured and trimmed, leaving the cigarette-maker to give her life for a purely paternal peck from the bashful bullfighter, Escamillo."

* More recent eliminations are equally interesting. For instance, the "Elimination Bulletins" of the Maryland State Board of Motion Picture Censors for December, 1929, and January, 1930, contain the following:

Three Loves: Eliminate close-up scene of girl lying on bed with sunlight on her legs.

Two Days: Eliminate all scenes of servant actually setting fire to his master's house. Eliminate scenes where servant shoots persons trying to escape from building.

Up the Congo: Eliminate all scenes where sex of child is shown.

The Village of Sin: Eliminate subtitle: "Just as if I were your wife." Eliminate scenes of father-in-law creeping into Anna's room and all scenes in the room. Reconstruct to eliminate all idea that father-in-law is the father of Anna's child.

Pandora's Box: Eliminate scene of Alva kissing Lulu passionately on the neck. Eliminate scene where Iuast's body is shown.

Party Girl: Cut to ten-foot flash scene of man dancing the hula-hula dance where he shows his underwear. Eliminate scene of couple seated — girl on man's lap — entire scene including dialogue: "My wife doesn't understand me."

The Massachusetts law applies to entertainments to be held on the Lord's Day. Following are some of the eliminations ordered during 1929:

Alibi: Scene showing close-up of dancing chorus. Scene showing body

have special movies, plays, and books for children — but this can surely be done without compelling adults to conform to the standards of twelve-year-olds. If we are to protect the public from all things which will arouse immoral thoughts, we have a large order indeed. Men incite women to lasciviousness, and women inspire lewd thoughts in men, and who is to censor the subtle influences of a June day or a moonlit night?*

A great deal of criticism was directed against *The Racket*, featuring Thomas Meighan and depicting political corruption in one of our larger cities. It was objected that this picture would destroy respect for law and government by showing public officials as bribe-givers and bribe-receivers. But is anything more destructive of this respect than the sordid facts upon which the picture was based and which it minimized rather than exaggerated? Who can read the nauseous tale of the oil scandals or the doings of New York, Philadelphia, and Chicago politicians and not have his respect for public officials diminished? Censorship, we venture to believe, by keeping such facts from the public does

---

of officer lying on sidewalk. Caption: "What do I care for the police? I hate their guts."

The Barker: Talking sequences in dialogue as follows: "She's half woman and half gin."

Broadway: Dialogue: "I'll make your shirt roll up your back like a window shade." "Well if it ain't God's little gift to the night clubs."

Cock-Eyed World: Nearly a full page of eliminations.

Fox Movietone News: Meet the 1929 bathing girl. Latest underwear styles for men.

Pathé News: New Orleans strikers fight police. Reference to Irish in dialogue of Rheba Crawford.

* It is perhaps only fair to point out that while the newspapers were publishing all of the nauseating details of the Peaches-Browning, Hall-Mills, and Snyder-Gray cases not a single foot of film was devoted to these. At the same time 477,000 feet of film were devoted to Lindbergh, and thousands more to the exploits of Commander Byrd, the fliers from Germany and Ireland, and the sacrificial mission of Floyd Bennett.

more harm than good. The causes of corruption lie at the roots of a materialistic civilization which worships Mammon and bows before the great god Greed.

Censorship has had a long and evil history. It has ever been the instrument of tyrants and those whose conduct would not stand the light of day. It killed Socrates and crucified Christ, it has lynched and murdered and robbed. Freedom is the handmaid of democracy, as censorship is the sister of oppression. We cannot prevent the censorship of the ideas of individuals and groups by other individuals and groups. But we can and must see to it that the government does not enter partnership with them. We can see to it that the police cease being made the tools of special interests who use the government forcibly to foist their own ideas upon the public under the guise of "the people's will" by suppressing those who oppose them.

Unless we wish to stretch our citizens upon the Procrustean bed of "things as they are," we must give free rein to opinions, whether they be well or ill informed. Error cannot be corrected by knocking people on the head. "Liberty, not license," say the censors. But who is to draw the line? As Walter Lippmann says:

> It seems to me perfectly clearly established that no official yet born on this earth is wise enough or generous enough to separate good ideas from bad ideas, good beliefs from bad beliefs, and that the utmost that anybody can ask of a government is that if it is efficient it should detect and run down criminal acts; that beyond reaching words which are the direct and immediate incitement to criminal acts, no government dare go.

No form of control short of imprisonment in a madhouse will prevent a feeble-minded man or child from shouting

"Fire!" in a crowded theater. We can raise the moral tone of a nation, not by treating its citizens as idiots, but by training them in habits of decency and sound judgment.

Censorship makes more revolutions than it prevents. There is sad humor in the efforts of the Daughters of the American Revolution to suppress revolutionary opinion. Revolutions are not caused by walking delegates but by poverty, oppression, and injustice. To attempt to prevent them by censorship is like taking a pill to prevent an earthquake. "If there be any among us," said Jefferson in 1801, "who would wish to dissolve the Union or change its republican form, let them stand undisturbed as monuments of the safety with which error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left to combat it." Abraham Lincoln, too, in his first inaugural reiterated the sacred right of the people "whenever they grow weary of the existing government [to] exercise their Constitutional right of amending it or their revolutionary right to dismember or overthrow it."

To allow the free expression of opinion is not to admit that all ideas have equal merit. It is no doubt true, as Mark Twain once said, that a lie can go around the world while the truth is putting on his shoes, but the truth wears the halter of the censor as often as does falsehood. "I do not agree with a word that you say," wrote Voltaire to Rousseau, "but I will defend to the death your right to say it." Democratic government can find no better slogan.

Censorship defeats itself. It prosecutes bad books, and they become best sellers; bad plays, and people flock to the theater; immoral movies, and box-office receipts mount. Suppression of men and ideas makes martyrs in America as

in pagan Rome. Speaking of what he termed his own unjust persecution, Vanzetti said to Judge Thayer:

If it had not been for these thing, I might have live out my life, talking at street corners to scorning men. I might have die, unmarked, unknown, a failure. Now we are not a failure. This is our career and our triumph. Never in our full life can we hope to do such work for tolerance, for joostice, for man's onderstanding of man, as now we do by an accident. Our words — our lives — our pains — nothing! The taking of our lives — lives of a good shoemaker and a poor fish peddler — all! That last moment belong to us — that agony is our triumph.

We commend this to all censors and their friends.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

General

Angell, Norman, The Public Mind. New York, 1927.

Beard, Charles, Rise of American Civilization. New York, 1927.

Bernays, E. L., Crystallizing Public Opinion. New York, 1923.

Dewey, John, The Public and Its Problems. New York, 1927.

Graves, Brooke, Readings in Public Opinion. New York, 1928.

Lippmann, Walter, Public Opinion. New York, 1922.

——— The Phantom Public. New York, 1925.

Lowell, A. L., Public Opinion and Popular Government. New York, 1913.

——— Public Opinion in War and Peace. Cambridge, 1923.

Parrington, V. L., Main Currents in American Thought. New York, 1927.

Perry, Bliss, The American Mind. Boston, 1912.

Santayana, George, Character and Opinion in America. New York, 1920.

Siegfried, André, America Comes of Age. New York, 1927.

Stearns, H. E., Civilization in the United States. New York, 1922.

Tyler, Moses, History of American Literature, 2 Vols. New York, 1875.

Chapter I

Bentley, M. and Others, Psychologies of 1925. Worcester, Mass., 1927.

Berman, Louis, Glands Regulating Personality. New York, 1928.

Berman, Louis, Religion Called Behaviorism. New York, 1928.
Bernard, L. L., Instinct. New York, 1924.
Boas, Franz, The Mind of Primitive Man. New York, 1911.
Bousfield, Paul, Pleasure and Pain. New York, 1926.
Bridges, H. J., Taking the Name of Science in Vain. New York, 1928.
Brown, William, Mind and Personality. New York, 1927.
Dewey, John, How We Think. Boston, 1910.
Dorsey, George, Why We Behave Like Human Beings. New York, 1925.
Fischer, J., Love and Morality. New York, 1927.
Freud, S., Delusion and Dream. New York, 1922.
——— Future of an Illusion. New York, 1928.
——— Interpretation of Dreams. New York, 1923.
Garnett, A. C., Instinct and Personality. New York, 1928.
Goldenweiser, A., The Social Sciences and Their Interrelations. New York, 1927.
Hankins, F. H., Racial Basis of Civilization. New York, 1926.
James, William, Principles of Psychology. New York, 1918.
Jung, C. G., Psychological Types. New York, 1926.
McDougall, William, Is America Safe for Democracy? New York, 1921.
Morgan, T. H., Theory of the Gene. New Haven, 1928.
Murchison, C., Foundations of Experimental Psychology. Worcester, 1929.
Patrick, G. T., What Is Mind? New York, 1929.
Pavlov, Ivan, Lectures on the Conditioned Reflex. New York, 1928.
Schlapp, M. G., and Smith, E. H., The New Criminology. New York, 1928.
Schmalhausen, S., Why We Misbehave. New York, 1928.
Stoddard, T. L., The Rising Tide of Color. New York, 1920.
——— Revolt against Civilization. New York, 1922.

Storck, John, Man and Civilization. New York, 1927.
Thorndike, E. L., The Original Nature of Man, *Educational Psychology* Vol. I. New York, 1913.
Tridon, A., Psychoanalysis and Behavior. New York, 1913.
Watson, J. B., Psychology from the Standpoint of a Behaviorist. Philadelphia, 1919.
——— The Ways of Behaviorism. New York, 1928.
——— Psychological Care of Infant and Child. New York, 1928.
Wiggam, A. E., The Fruit of the Family Tree. New York, 1924.

Chapter II

Allport, F., The Group Fallacy. Hanover, N. H., 1927.
——— Social Psychology. Boston, 1924.
Bagehot, Walter, Physics and Politics. London, 1915 edition.
Bell, Clive, Civilization. New York, 1928.
Dewey, John, Human Nature and Conduct. New York, 1922.
Edman, Irwin, Human Traits and Their Social Significance. Boston, 1920.
Follett, M. P., The New State. London, 1918.
McDougall, William, Introduction to Social Psychology. Boston, 1926.
——— The Group Mind. New York, 1920.
McIver, R. M., Community. New York, 1924.
Martin, E. D., The Behavior of Crowds. New York, 1920.
Overstreet, H., Influencing Human Behavior. New York, 1925.
Randall, J. H., Jr., Making of the Modern Mind. Boston, 1926.
——— Our Changing Civilization. New York, 1929.
Robinson, J. H., The Mind in the Making. New York, 1921.
Steiner, J. F., American Community in Action. New York, 1928.

THRASHER, F. M., The Gang. Chicago, 1927.
TROTTER, W., Instincts of the Herd in Peace and War. New York, 1926.
WALLAS, G., Our Social Heritage. New Haven, 1921.
——— The Great Society. New York, 1914.
WHITE, W., Rope and Faggott. New York, 1928.
WILLIAMS, J. M., Principles of Social Psychology. New York, 1922.
YOUNG, KIMBALL, Source Book for Social Psychology. New York, 1927.

CHAPTER III

BROWN, W. A., The Church in America. New York, 1922.
CALHOUN, A. W., Social History of the American Family, 3 Vols. New York, 1917-1919.
CALVERTON, V. F., The Bankruptcy of Marriage. New York, 1928.
DAVIS, K. B., Factors in the Sex Life of Twenty-two Hundred Women. New York, 1929.
DRAKE, DURANT, The New Morality. New York, 1928.
FEDERAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST, Religion among American Men. New York, 1920.
GARRISON, WINIFRED, Catholicism and the American Mind. New York, 1928.
GOODSELL, W., History of the Family As a Social and Educational Institution. New York, 1915.
GRIMBERG, L., Emotion and Delinquency. New York, 1928.
GROVES, E. R., Marriage Crisis. New York, 1928.
HAMILTON, G. V., AND K. MACGOWAN, What Is Wrong with Marriage? New York, 1929.
KEYSERLING, H. A., Book of Marriage. New York, 1926.
LINDSEY, BEN, AND W. EVANS, Companionate Marriage. New York, 1927.

Lindsey and Evans, The Revolt of Youth. New York, 1926.
Lippmann, Walter, A Preface to Morals. New York, 1929.
McConnell, F. J., Humanism and Christianity. New York, 1928.
MacFarland, C. S., Progress of Church Federation. New York, 1921.
Marshall, C. C., Roman Catholic Church in the Modern State. New York, 1928.
Mecklin, J. M., The Ku Klux Klan. New York, 1924.
Mowrer, E. R., Family Disorganization. Chicago, 1927.
Odegard, P. H., Pressure Politics, the Story of the Anti-Saloon League. New York, 1928.
Shipley, M., The War on Modern Science. New York, 1927.
Sinclair, Upton, The Profits of Religion. New York, 1927.
Russell, Bertrand, Marriage and Morals. New York, 1929.
Van Waters, M., Youth in Conflict. New York.
Weigle, L. A., Training of Children in the Christian Family. New York, 1922.
Woywod, S., New Canon Law; Commentary on the Revised Code. New York, 1925.

Chapter IV

Cattell, J. M., University Control. New York, 1913.
Cook, W. A., Federal and State School Administration. New York, 1927.
Counts, George, Social Composition of Boards of Education. Chicago, 1927.
——— School and Society in Chicago. New York, 1928.
Dewey, John, Democracy and Education. New York, 1916.
——— Schools of Tomorrow. New York, 1915.
Dorr, Rheta C., Susan B. Anthony. New York, 1928.
Flanders, J. K., Legislative Control of the Elementary Curriculum. New York, 1925.

Jones, H. A., Patriotism and Popular Education. New York, 1919.
McConn, Max, College or Kindergarten? New York, 1928.
Martin, E. D., Meaning of a Liberal Education. New York, 1926.
Meiklejohn, A., The Liberal College. Boston, 1920.
——— Freedom and the College. New York, 1923.
Pierce, Bessie, Public Opinion and the Teaching of History. New York, 1926.
Robinson, J. H., The Humanizing of Knowledge. New York, 1926.
Russell, B., Education and the Good Life. New York, 1926.
Sinclair, Upton, The Goose Step. Pasadena, 1923.
——— The Goslings. Pasadena, 1924.
Veblen, T., The Higher Learning in America. New York, 1918.

Chapter V

Angell, Norman, The Press and the Organization of Society. London, 1922.
Belloc, H., The Free Press. London, 1918.
Bent, Silas, Ballyhoo; the Voice of the Press. New York, 1928.
——— Strange Bedfellows. New York, 1928.
Bleyer, W. G., The Profession of Journalism. New York, 1918.
——— Main Currents in the History of American Journalism. Boston, 1927.
Dawson, Thos., Law of the Press. London, 1927.
Essary, J. F., Covering Washington. Boston, 1927.
Gibbs, Philip, Adventures in Journalism. London, 1923.
Hale, W. G., Law of the Press (U. S.). St. Paul, 1923.
Hughes, S. L., Press, Platform, and Parliament. London, 1918.
Independent Labour Party, The Capitalist Press, Who Owns It and Why. London, 1923.

Johnson, G. W., What Is News? New York, 1926.
Lee, J. M., History of American Journalism. New York, 1923.
Mahin, Helen, The Development and Significance of the Newspaper Headline. Ann Arbor, 1924.
Nevins, A., Newspaper Opinion in America. New York, 1928.
Salmon, Lucy, Newspaper and Authority. Oxford, 1923.
Sinclair, Upton, The Brass Check. Pasadena, 1920.
Stevens, D. H., Party Politics and English Journalism. Chicago, 1916.
Villard, O. G., Some Newspapers and Newspaper Men. New York, 1923.
White, E. B., American Opinion of France from Lafayette to Poincare. New York, 1927.

Chapter VI

Anonymous, Behind the Scene in Politics. New York, 1924.
Beard, Charles, The American Party Battle. New York, 1928.
Eldridge, Seba, The New Citizenship. New York, 1929.
Ford, H. J., Rise and Growth of American Politics. New York, 1900.
Hibben, Paxton, The Peerless Leader, William Jennings Bryan. New York, 1929.
Holcombe, A. N., Political Parties of Today. New York, 1924.
Howe, F. C., Confessions of a Reformer. Scribner, 1925.
Kent, Frank, The Great Game of Politics. New York, 1923.
——— Political Behavior. New York, 1928.
Lippmann, Walter, Drift and Mastery. New York, 1914.
McBain, H. L., DeWitt Clinton and the Origin of the Spoils System in New York. New York, 1907.
Mencken, H. L., Notes on Democracy. New York, 1926.
Merriam, Charles, Chicago. New York, 1929.
Merriam, Charles, and H. Gosnell, The American Party System. New York, 1929.

Munroe, W. B., Personality in Politics. New York, 1924.
Orth, S. P., The Boss and the Machine. New Haven, 1919.
Ostrogorski, M., Democracy and the Organization of Political Parties. New York, 1902.
Pringle, H. F., Alfred E. Smith, a Critical Study. New York, 1927.
Rice, Stuart, Quantitative Methods in the Study of Politics. New York, 1928.
——— Farmers and Workers in American Politics. New York, 1924.
Riordan, W. I., Plunkitt of Tammany Hall. New York, 1905.
Sait, E. M., American Parties and Elections. New York, 1927.
Underwood, O. W., Drifting Sands of Party Politics. New York, 1928.
Weyl, Walter, Tired Radicals. New York, 1921.
——— New Democracy. New York, 1927.
Wolfe, A. B., Conservatism, Radicalism, and the Scientific Method. New York, 1923.
Wooddy, C. H., Chicago Primary of 1926. Chicago, 1926.

Chapter VII

Bernays, E. L., Propaganda. New York, 1928.
Blanchard, T., Essentials of Advertising. New York, 1921.
Borden, N. H., Problems in Advertising. New York, 1927.
Calkins, E. E., The Business of Advertising. New York, 1920.
Childs, H. L., Labor and Capital in National Politics. Columbus, 1930.
Chapman, J. J., Practical Agitation. New York, 1919.
Cover, J. H., Advertising. New York, 1926.
Creel, George, How We Advertised America. New York, 1920.
De Weese, T. A., Principles of Practical Publicity. Philadelphia, 1908.

Durstine, R. S., Making Advertisements and Making Them Pay. New York, 1920.

French, George, Advertising, the Social and Economic Problem. New York, 1915.

Goodall, G. W., Advertising, a Study of Modern Business Power; Introduction by Sidney Webb. London, 1914.

Goode, K., and H. Powel, What about Advertising? New York, 1927.

Hamlin, C. H., The War Myth in United States History. New York, 1927.

Hasbrouck, P., Party Government in the House of Representatives. New York, 1927.

Herring, E. P., Group Representation before Congress. Washington, 1929.

Hopkins, C., My Life in Advertising. New York, 1927.

Hotchkiss, G., and R. B. Franken, Measurement of Advertising Effects. New York, 1927.

Laswell, H. D., Propaganda Technique in the World War. New York, 1928.

Lee, Ivy, Publicity. New York, 1925.

Long, J. C., Public Relations. New York, 1924.

Odegard, P. H., Pressure Politics. New York, 1928.

Ponsonby, A., Falsehood in War Time. New York, 1929.

Steuart, J., Wayne Wheeler — Dry Boss. New York, 1928.

Chapter VIII

American Academy of Political and Social Science, The Motion Picture in Its Economic and Social Aspects (*Annals*). Philadelphia, 1926.

Bloem, W. S., The Soul of the Moving Picture. New York, 1924.

Bollman, Gladys, Motion Pictures for Community Needs, New York, 1922.

Calverton, V. F., The Newer Spirit. New York, 1925.
Croy, Homer, How Moving Pictures Are Made. New York, 1918.
Dench, E. A., Advertising by Motion Pictures. New York, 1916.
Felix, E. H., Using Radio in Sales Promotion. New York, 1927.
Foster, W. T., Vaudeville and Motion Picture Shows in Portland, Oregon. Reed College, 1914.
Freeburg, V. O., The Art of Photoplay Making. New York, 1918.
Freeman, F. N., Visual Education. Chicago, 1924.
Hollis, A. P., Motion Pictures for Instruction. New York, 1926.
Krutch, J. W., The Modern Temper. New York, 1929.
Lashley, K. S., and J. Watson, Psychological Study of Motion Pictures in Relation to Venereal Disease Campaigns. Amer. Soc. Hygiene Association, 1922.
Lescarboura, A. C., The Cinema Handbook. New York, 1921.
Lindsay, Vachel, The Art of the Moving Picture. New York, 1916.
Mayes, H. R., Horatio Alger. New York, 1928.
Merz, Charles, The Great American Band Wagon. New York, 1928.
Mitchell, Alice, Children and Movies. Chicago, 1929.
Münsterberg, Hugo, The Photoplay; a Psychological Study. New York, 1916.
National Catholic Welfare Conference, Morals of the Movies. Washington, n.d.
Oberholtzer, E. P., Morals of the Movie. Philadelphia, 1922.
O'Higgins, Harvey, The American Mind in Action. New York, 1924.
Parlin, C. C., Merchandising by Radio. Philadelphia, 1925.

Pearson, E. L., Dime Novels. Boston, 1929.
Phelan, J. J., Motion Pictures and Commercial Amusement in Toledo. Toledo, 1919.
Santayana, George, Character and Opinion in America. New York, 1920.
Seabury, Wm., The Public and the Motion Picture Industry. New York, 1926.
Seldes, Gilbert, The Seven Lively Arts. New York, 1924.
Sherman, Stuart, The Genius of America. New York, 1923.
——— Americans. New York, 1922.
Sinclair, Upton, Money Writes. New York, 1928.
——— What's the Use of Books? New York, 1926.
Speare, M. E., The Political Novel. New York, 1924.
Sullivan, Mark, Our Times; the Turn of the Century. New York, 1926.

Chapter IX

Acton, J. E., (1st Baron), History of Freedom. London, 1909.
Carlyle, A. J., The Christian Church and Liberty. New York, 1924.
Chaffee, Z., Freedom of Speech. New York, 1920.
Dennett, Mary, Who's Obscene? New York, 1930.
Dawson, S. A., Freedom of the Press. New York, 1924.
Ernst, M. L., and William Seagle, To the Pure; a Study in Obscenity and the Censor. New York, 1928.
Ernst, M. L., and B. Lorentz, Censored; the Private Life of the Movies. New York, 1930.
Frankfurter, Felix, The Case of Sacco and Vanzetti. New York, 1927.
Frankfurter, Marion, and Gardner Jackson, The Letters of Sacco and Vanzetti. New York, 1928.
Hays, A. G., Let Freedom Ring. New York, 1928.
Lippmann, Walter, Liberty and the News. New York, 1927.

LIPPMANN, WALTER, American Inquisitors. New York, 1928.
MILL, J. S., Essay on Liberty. Oxford, 1912.
MILTON, JOHN, Areopagitica. New York, Everyman, 1927.
POST, L., The Deportations Delirium. Chicago, 1923.
RUSSELL, B., Free Thought and Official Propaganda. New York, 1922.
——— Justice in War Time. Chicago, 1916.
WHIPPLE, L., Civil Liberty in America. New York, 1927.
YOUNG, KIMBALL, Bibliography for Propaganda and Censorship. University of Oregon, 1928.

INDEX

Abie's Irish Rose, 210
Abnormal behavior, 23-26
Abortions, 53
Adams, Henry, *Democracy*, 242
Adams, J. T., 16
Adrenal glands, 20
Adultery, 49
Advertising, influence on Press, 118 ff.; relation to circulation, 120 f.; as instrument of propaganda, 188 ff.; methods, 190-94; "make 'em weep," 192; psychology of, 193 f.; cigarette, 194; "tainted testimonials," 194; strikes at capitalism, 195; for peace, 196-97; movies as media for, 205, 208 f.; pays cost of radio, 227, 230; radio as medium for, 233 ff.
Alger, Horatio, influence of, 241; *see also* Butcher, Lewis
Alien and Sedition Acts, 252; *see also* Berger, Victor
All Quiet on the Western Front, 245
All States News Bureau, publicity office of General Sugars, 183, note
America, frontier in, 28 f.; materialism and morality, 31; as pictured in movies, 208 f.
America (Catholic publication), on lobbying, 75, note
American Association of Advertising Agencies, study of newspaper circulation, 127 f.
American Federation of Labor, 38; in politics, 150 f.; promotes unionism, 186; *see also* Labor
Americanism, case of Victor Berger, 256
Americanization, through stereotypes, 44
American Revolution, 252
Anderson, Sherwood, 244
Angell, Norman, on newspapers, 114
Anger, 15
Anthony, Susan B., 79
Anthropology, 8 f.; movies of primitive peoples, 207; *see also* Race
Anti-Saloon League, pressure organization, 168; legislation by, 170; lobbying methods of, 175 f.; extent of propaganda of, 178-180
Aristotle, influence of, 239
Arliss, George, in *Disraeli*, 220
Armstrong, O. K., survey of newspaper content, 124
Army, religious opinion in, 62
Arnold, Frank, on radio advertising, 234
Associated Press, use of by public utilities, 135
Association against Prohibition

Amendment, wet propaganda and, 180 f.
Atheism, 250, 251
Audience, size of movie, 199; radio, 233; character of radio, 236, note, 237
Average man, 190, 197

Bagehot, Walter, 32, 260
Bakshy, Alexander, on *Disraeli*, 220
Ballot, 153
Beard, Charles and Mary, *Rise of American Civilization*, cited, 28; *Economic Interpretation of the Constitution of the United States*, cited, 46; on education, 101; on the citizen and propaganda, 186; on Victor Berger, 256
Behaviorists, 11 ff.
Bent, Silas, on crime news, 124; on Hall-Mills murder trial, 127; on standardized news, 130
Berger, Victor, denied seat in Congress, 256
Bernard, L. L., 6
Betts, George H., study of religious beliefs, 63 f.
Bible, The, its influence, 239
Big business, in the schools, 90 ff.; Press and, 117, 120, 128 ff.; political parties and, 143; pressure groups and, 168 f.; in the government, 170 ff.; propaganda of, against "Reds," 185
Big Parade, The, barred from Australia, 209
Bimba, Anthony, arrested for blasphemy, 251
Binder, Rudolph, survey of religious opinion, 65 f.
Birth control, 53; Methodists endorse, 66, note; Catholics lobby against, 75, note; censorship and, 267 ff.
Bismarck, Otto von, on Press, 115
Blackstone, 50
Blasphemy, 251, 260
Bliven, Bruce, on editorial opinion, 120; "few people want the truth," 138
Bloch, Blanche, on radio music, 227
Blocs, as means of representation, 166 ff.; *see also* Longworth, Nicholas; farm, 167-170; legislative, 167; *see also* Davis, John W.
Blythe, Samuel G., on political differences, 140
Boas, Franz, 8 f.
Bolsheviks, as stereotype, 186 f., 190; in American movies, 203
Book clubs, 247
Books, 238-47; censorship of, 264-69
Boston, censorship of books in, 265 f.
Bowers, Claude, on party differences, 140
Brennan, "Bill," supported by Insull, 143
Bright, George, amusing campaign circular, 163
Brisbane, Arthur, 121 f.; his "message," 131 f.; on *The Jungle*, 244
Broadcasting, National Broadcasting Company, 224; number of stations, 232; cost of, 235; code of ethics, 237 f.

Bryan, W. J., campaign of 1896, 150
Bryce, James, on political differences, 141
Burns, William J., denounces liberals, 232
Butcher, Lewis, on influence of Horatio Alger, 242

Cadman, S. Parkes, on the radio, 223, 229
Calverton, V. F., 53
Calvin, John, 30; and revolt, 248
Calvinists, view of marriage, 49
Campaign, political, methods, 155 ff.; use of radio in, 225 f.
Candidate, qualifications, 157 f.
Case of Sergeant Grischa, 245
Catholic Church, 33, 38; attitude of Protestants toward, 67 ff.; public education and, 70, 94; attitude toward marriage, 70 f.; attitude toward prohibition, 71; relation to political state, 71 f.; claims supremacy, 72; attitude toward evolution, 73; political activity, 74 f.; Catholic Alumnae and movies, 203; birth control and, 267
Catholic Encyclopedia, cited, 72
Cattell, J. M., 4, 10; *University Control*, cited, 103; on University Club, 113
Censorship, of advertising, 194; movies' campaign against, 203; list of tabu movie topics, 217 f.; radio, 231 f.; and democracy, 248-79; in war time, 252-54; state laws, 262 f.; of the theater, 269-71; of the movies, 271-77
Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 170 f.; propaganda against reforms, 186
Chase, Canon Wm. S., advocates federal censorship of movies, 272
Chase, Stuart, on financing radio, 231; on freak broadcasting, 232
Chautauqua, effect of movies on, 211
Chesterton, G. K., 57
Chicago, gangs, 54 f.; religious beliefs of ministers, 64; *Tribune* attacks pacifism in schools, 93 f.
Christianity, and marriage, 48 f.; attitude of American soldiers toward, 62; and power, 248
Church, the, 57-76; membership in United States, 58; federation of Protestant sects, 59; ideals of Federal Council, 59 f.; evolution and, 63, 64 f.; relation to political state, 71 f.; use of movies in, 207; during World War, 196; medieval, 248
Churchill, Winston, influence of, 242
Circulation, influence on newspaper policy, 120 ff.; increase of, 129
Cities, religious opinion in, 62, 66; Catholics in, 67; politically doubtful, 145; underrepresented, 151
Cities Service, use of radio, 236, note
Civil Liberties Union, American, radio and, 232
Colleges, 82, 101-13; control by boards of trustees, 102; reaction in, 103; propanganda in, 103 f., 104, note; H. R. Mussey on pro-

fessors in, 105; specialization of college faculties, 105 f.; struggle for intellectual life in, 107 ff.; purpose of, 109 f.; alumni of, 110; *Good-bye England*, 111 f.; and public opinion, 112; university of the air, 226
Comics, 131
Common law, position of women under, 49
Commonweal, survey of religious attitudes, 68 f.
Communists, 38, 39, 41, 43; criminals in California, 255; *see also* Marx, Karl
Companionate marriage, 53 f.
Comstock, Anthony, and *September Morn*, 188; and sex appeal, 193; "Comstock Law," 261, 262; influence of, on nation, 263-64; Comstock Law and movies, 271 f.
Conditioned response, 13 ff.; advertising and, 194
Congressional districts, party control of, 145
Conservatives, 139; in major parties, 148; American labor movement, 151
Constitution, of the United States, 34 f.; National Security League demands education in, 92 f.; model text on, 99; reverence for, 185; and religious liberty, 250-51; sources of, 239; in war time, 253 f.
Counts, George, on school boards, 88; *School and Society in Chicago*, cited, 89
Crabtree, J. W., denounces activities of public utilities, 91
Creel, George, chairman of the Committee on Public Information, 197, note; *How We Advertized America*, cited, 197, note
Crime, family and, 54 f.; news, 124 ff.; influence of movies on, 212 f., 276; *see also* Sutherland, E. H., and Kirchwey, George
Crowd behavior, 35-41; influence on newspaper policy, 122 f., 137
Cunliffe, Dr. John, on Press censorship, 261
Curriculum, legislative control of, 96 ff
Customs, power of authorities to censor, 262

Damrosch, Walter, broadcasts symphony concerts, 228
D.A.R., 33, 37; propaganda of, 183 f.; on censorship, 270
Darwin, Charles, *Origin of Species*, 239
Davis, John W., on farm bloc, 167
Davis, Dr. Katherine B., 53; study of sources of sex information, 266 f.
Dawes, Charles G., on Chamber of Commerce, 171
Declaration of Independence, 35, 252
Defense mechanism, 24 f.
Delinquents, 54
Delusions, of persecution, of grandeur, 37 f., 72
Democracy, education and, 99; political parties and, 139 ff.; direct and radio, 224 f.; censorship and, 248-79; demands freedom of

speech to survive, 248; a novel by Henry Adams, 242
Democrats, newspapers and, 116; doggerel on, 139; ideals of, 140; states' rights and, 142; protective tariff and, 142; prohibition and, 143; why party endures, 144 f.; K.K.K. and, 146; New York organization, 152 f.; as voting group, 166 f.
Denberg, Dr. J. K., 78
Dennett, Mary Ware, *The Sex Side of Life*, censored, 267
Descartes, Réné, 16
Dill, Senator C. C., 233
Dime novels, 241
Disarmament, church and, 59 f.
Divorce, rate in U. S., 51 f.
Dodge Brothers Motor Company, radio broadcasting, 234
"Dooley, Mr.," on tariff, 142; on *The Jungle*, 243 f.
Dreiser, Theodore, 244
Dunne, Finley Peter, *see* "Dooley, Mr."
Durstine, Roy, on radio advertising, 235

Edison Company, New York, radio concerts, 228
Editor, influence of, 117 f.
Editor and Publisher, cited, 129, 135
Education, through stereotypes, 44, 99 f.; attitude of Catholics toward, 70; in the schools, 77 ff.; sex and, 80; educational qualifications of teachers, 81 ff.; 82, note; patriotic, 86, 87, 97; boards of, 87 ff.; special interests and, 88; by means of public utility textbooks, 90 f.; by patriotic propaganda, 92 ff.; Federal Dept. of, suggested, 95; outlook for, 95 f.; in social studies, 98, note; democracy and, 99; theory of, in United States, 100, 101, note; in colleges, 101-113; use of movies, 206 ff.; of public, by propaganda, 181 f.; by radio, 226 f.
Edwards, Thomas C., on health movies, 206
Einstein, Albert, denounced by Cardinal O'Connell, 72
Elections, frequency of, in United States, 144; rainfall and, 148, note; primary, 153 ff.; campaign methods, 155 ff.
Ellis, Havelock, 3, 10
England, political parties in, 140; resents American movies, 209; study of movies in, 213; radio in, 230; censorship of Press in, 261
Environment, 2-18, 23-26
Epstein, Abraham, 57, note
Ernst, Morris, and William Seagle, study of censorship, 264 ff.; defends Mrs. Dennett, 268 f.
Espionage, Act of 1917, 253
Ethics, code of National Broadcasters Association, 237 f.
Eugenics, 4, 11
Europe, political parties in, 140; American movies in, 208 f.
Evolution, church and, 63, 64 f., 66; attitude of Catholics, 73; teaching of, prohibited, 94, 96; laws on, 251 f.
Exner, Dr. M. J., 80

Factory system, influence on family, 51 f.
Family, 47-57; factory system and, 51 f.; school, 51; divorce, 51 f.; farm, 52; birth control, 53; political opinions and, 54; crime and, 54 f.; conflict in, 55; political allegiance and, 144 f.; use of radio, 224
Farm, and family life, 52; political opinion on, 145; 147 f.; influence of movies on, 206; use of radio on, 228, 229, note
Farmer-Labor Party, 151
Fear, 14
Federal censorship of movies, 272
Federal Council of the Churches of Christ, on marriage, 56; ideals of, 59 f.; survey of religious opinion, 62
Fellowship Forum, anti-Catholic publication, 68 f.
Fish, Hamilton, spread-eagle oratory, 232
Follett, M. P., 27
Ford, Paul L., *The Honorable Peter Stirling*, 242
Fosdick, Harry E., on the radio, 223, 229
Franklin, Benjamin, 240
Freedom, of speech, among teachers, 85-87; for college professors, 104 f.; 248 ff.; in war time, 252 f.; of thought, 258
Freud, Dr. Sigmund, 26
Frontier, in America, 28 f.; materialism and morality of, 31
Fundamentalists, 62 ff.

Galsworthy, John, on the crowd, 40
Galton, Sir Francis, 3, 10
Gangs, *see* Thrasher, Frederick
Garrison, Winifred, 67
German, World War stereotype, 196
Gestalt, psychology, 16
Gibbs, Sir Philip, 123
Gilbert, W. S., 139
Gillespie, T. N., 82
Gillette, D. C., on Chautauqua, 211
Glands, ductless, 19-22
Glyn, Elinor, *Three Weeks*, 266
Gobineau, 5, 8
Government, by bloc system, 166 ff.; government ownership, 181; bureau of propaganda, 197, note; democratic, 248; constitutional government in war, 254; danger of criticising, 255 f.; and birth control, 268
Gowin, E. B., on physical size and leadership, 157, note
Grant, Madison, 5
Graustein, Archibald, 135
Great Western Sugar Company, 175
Greeley, Horace, influence as editor, 114
Green, William, 38
Griffith, D. W., *The Birth of a Nation*, 201
Group mind, 31 f.
Groups, in America, 166 ff.; representative, 167 f.; political parties and, 167; manufacturing, 168 f., 169, note; reform, 170; in major parties, 146 f.; business, 170; "the invisible government," 172; patriotic, propaganda of, 183 f.; part played in politics by, 186 f.

Guest, Edgar, "poet of the plain people," 245 f.

Habits, 15; of parents and children, 56; influence of advertising on, 189 f.; as portrayed in movies, 208 f.; habit patterns and the law, 251
Hall, Ray, editor *Fox News Reels*, 204 f.
Hamilton, Alexander, political ideals, 140
Hamilton, Clayton, on influence of movies, 199
Hamlin, C. H., *The War Myth in United States History*, cited, 197, note
Harbord, General J. G., on use of radio, 225
Harding, Warren G., in news reels, 204
Hartley, Roland G., campaign methods, 162
Hays, Will, Czar of movies, 203; movies as advertising media, 205; forbids filming of *Spread Eagle*, 211; on high tone of movies, 213
Headlines, 136 ff.
Health, Michigan Board of, 53; advertising and, 186, 192; movies promote, 206
Hearst, W. R., and Cuban war, 115; use of forged documents, 115; advertising rates, 120; newspaper policy, 122, 123
Heflin, Senator Thomas, 38; on un-American doctrines in schools, 95; member of same party as Alfred E. Smith, 147
Helvetius, 2
Henderson, W. K., denounces chain stores, 232
Herd, the, characteristics of, 33 ff.; influence of, 36; education of, 87 ff., 166 ff., 181; stereotypes of, 189 ff.; influence of movies, 201 f.
Heredity, 2-12
Heroic age, 239
Herring, E. P., *Group Representation before Congress*, cited, 168; quoted, 187
Hibben, Paxton, cited, 151, note
Hill, John Philip, campaign methods, 162 f.
Hillis, Newell Dwight, on Germans, 196
Holmes, Justice Oliver Wendell, on constitution in war time, 253; on Schwimmer case, 257
Homer, influence on Greek civilization, 239
Homogeneity, demanded in group, 33 ff.
Hoover, Herbert, use of newspapers, 115; campaign literature, 159; use of radio, 225
Hubbard, Elbert, *Scrap Book*, 247
Hughes, Charles Evans, on constitutional government in war time, 254; on ejection of socialists, 257
Hughes, Rupert, 34
Hopkins, Claude C., on advertising, 191
Hutchins, Robert, on education, 103; on college students, 113
Hysteria, 23; in the crowd, 37, 39 f.; following war, 254

Illiteracy, in the United States, 78

Imitation, influence of, 32
Individual, differences, 1-26; and society, 27 f.; and imitation, 30; in the crowd, 36 ff.; relation to political parties, 139 f.
Inferiority complex, 25 f.; in the crowd, 36; in teaching profession, 79
Instinct, 5-7, 11; gregarious, 27
Insull, Samuel, contributes to party funds, 143
Insurgency, political, 147 f.
Intelligence tests, 4
International Advertising Association, survey of religious opinion, 61 f.
International Federation of Catholic Alumnae, censors movies, 203
International Paper and Power Company, purchases newspapers, 135
International Walther League, 64
Interstitial glands, 20 f.
Intolerance, Catholics and, 72 f.; religious, 248 ff.
Introspection, as a method in psychology, 8
I.W.W., criminals in California, 255

James, William, 7
Jazz Singer, The, 219
Jefferson, Rev. Charles E., on religion and politics, 76, note
Jefferson, Thomas, 34, 35; political ideals, 140; as a stereotype, 157; freedom of speech, 248, 278; repeal of Alien and Sedition Acts, 252
Jennings, H. S., 8, 9
Jews, 33; in teaching profession, 84
Jungle, The, see Sinclair, Upton
Justice, United States Department of, activities following World War, 254

Kaltenborn, H. V., on radio censorship, 231 f.
Kellogg, Vernon, on Germans, 196
Kemal, Mustapha, 115
Kempf, W., 19
Kent, Frank, on political machine, 154; on lobbyists, 176; on campaign methods, 162 f., 164 f.
Kentucky, censorship of bathers, 263
Key Men of America, active against "Reds," 184 f.; denounce Russian movies, 202
Kirchwey, George, defends movies, 216
Knights of Columbus, 38
Knox, Col. Frank, on use of Hearst services, 130
Ku Klux Klan, 5, 38; Protestant church and, 60; in Democratic convention, 146; *The Birth of a Nation*, 201

Labor, attitude of church toward, 59; school boards and, 89, 94; attitude of Press toward, 119, 120; in American politics, 150 f.; in the movies, 202; radio and, 231; spies, 254; laws discriminating against, 255
Labor Party, why none in United States, 150 f.
La Follette, Robert M., denounced, 160

Lamarck, 2
Language, 17; influence of talkies on, 223
Larrabee, H. A., cited, 202, note
Lashley, and Watson, study of movies, 212
Laswell, Harold, *Propaganda Technique in the World War*, cited, 197
Lawrence, David, on the radio, 228
Legislation, secured by blocs and organized groups, 167 ff.; tariff, 168 f.; Anti-Saloon League secures, 170
Lenin, N., in American movies, 204
Lewis, Sinclair, 244
Liberty, the child and, 55 f.; and power, 248
Lincoln, Abraham, 34, 35; New York *Tribune* and, 114; as a stereotype, 157; quoted, 253; on freedom of speech, 278
Lincoln, Robert Todd, 10
Lippmann, Walter, vii, 39, 42, 121; on censorship, 277
Literature, public opinion and, 238-47
Lobbying, churches and, 73 ff.; legislation and, 167 ff., 171, note; methods, 173 ff., 184 f.; packing the galleries, 177, 178, note; *see also* Shearer, W. B.; Kent, Frank; and Nicholson, S. E.
Loeb-Leopold case, 24
Locke, John, 1; influence on American Constitution, 239
Longworth, Nicholas, on bloc government, 167
Lowell, A. Lawrence, on functions of parties, 143 f.
Lund's law of Primacy and Persuasion, 54
Lusk laws, 86
Luther, Martin, 30; on marriage, 48 f.; and revolt, 248

Maas, Fritz, 4, 10
Macaulay, Lord, on political differences, 139
McConn, Dean Max, *College or Kindergarten*, cited, 109; on purposes of college, 109 f.
McConnell, Bishop Francis J., 59, note
McDougall, William, 4, 5, 9
McFadden, Bernarr, "True Story" hour, 228
McGoldrick, Joseph, on Tammany, 152 f.
Macgowan, Kenneth, on little theaters, 223
McGuffey, influence of, 240 f.
Machiavelli, grammar for statesmen, 239
MacIntosh, Professor, denied citizenship, 258
McManus, Theodore, on advertising, 192 f.
Madison, James, on political parties, 140
Manufacturers, National Association of, 168 f.; campaign against unions, 186; *see also* National Council for Industrial Defense
Marriage, 48 ff.; companionate, 53 f.; Catholic attitude toward, 70; in teaching profession, 79, 80, 81, note, 84; Mormons and, 250 f.; *see also* Federal Council of Churches of Christ

Marshall, Robert, on rainfall and political behavior, 148, note
Martin, E. D., on the crowd, 37; on education, 103
Marvin, Fred R., *see* Key Men of America
Marx, Karl, 31; influence of, 240
Massachusetts, censorship law, 262
Mather, Cotton, on heresy, 249
Meighan, Thomas, *The Racket*, 276
Meiklejohn, Alexander, on teachers, 104
Mencken, Henry L., debunker, 245
Mendel, 2
Mermey, Maurice, on the "vanishing fiddler," 222
Merriam, Charles, 54
Merz, Charles, *The Great American Band Wagon*, cited, 167; study of radio programs, 227; defends radio, 230
Methodist Board of Temperance, Prohibition and Public Morals, 73
Michigan Board of Health, 53
Middletown, cited, 57
Middle West, religious opinion in, 62
Millikan, Dr. R. A., on English radio, 230
Mills, Ogden, attacks Alfred E. Smith, 160
Mind, instinctivist view, 7; behaviorist view, 16 ff.; group mind, 32
Minehan, Thomas, 84, 85
Ministers, opinions of, 63 f.
Minnesota, censorship of Press, 260
Minor parties, as "trial balloons," 151 f.
Missionary, The, urges election of Alfred E. Smith, 74
Mississippi, censorship of Press, 260 f.
Mitchell, Alice Miller, study of movies, 214, note
Modernists, 62, 66; in theological seminaries, 65
Moody, D. L., spoke to 100,000,000 people, 225
Moore, George, vii
Morals, Puritans and, 30; World War and, 32; and religion, 66; for teachers, 83 f.; as portrayed in movies, 208; effect of movies on, 209, 211 ff.; advertising and, 193, 194; intellectual morality destroyed by propaganda, 196; and Christianity, 250; and censorship, 262 f.; standards change, 266
Morgan, T. H., 9, 11
Mormons, 250 f.
Moskowitz, Mrs. Henry, publicity adviser for Alfred E. Smith, 188 f.
Motion pictures, 198-223; as an industry, 199; as emotional outlet, 200, 205 f., 216; a perfect scenario, 201; fight shy of propaganda, 202; news reels, 204 f.; as advertising media, 205, 208 f.; patriotic movies, 206; American, in foreign countries, 208 f.; declared a menace by Pope, 209; effect on theater, 210 f.; effect on Chautauqua, 211; influence on morals, 212 ff.; tabu topics, 217; influence on music, 218, 221 f.; censorship of, 271-77; *see also*

Mitchell, Alice; Sutherland, E. H.; and Kirchwey, George
Muckrakers, the, 243
Munsey, Frank, 129
Music, influence of movies on, 218; 221 f.; on the radio, 227
Mussey, Henry Raymond, 105, 110

Nast, Thomas, cartoons of Tweed, 198
Nathan, George J., on talkies, 221
National Board of Review, 271 f.
National Catholic Welfare Conference, lobbying of, 75
National Council for Industrial Defense, as pressure group, 169, note
National League of Women Voters, 186
National Radio Press Association, 236
National Security Leage, 39; propaganda of, 184
Nebraska, state senate "leak," 260
Nelson, Henry Loomis, on tariff, 169
Neuroses, 23 f.
News, colored, 132 ff.; headlines, 136 ff.; publicity in, 183 and note; news reels, 204 f.
Newspaper, 114-38; as political barometer, 115 f.; influence on public opinion, 116 f.; cost of, 117; income, 118; owners as capitalists, 120; Hearst policies, 122, 123; tabloids, 125 f.; readers, 127 f.; consolidation, 128 ff.; features, 130 ff.; "prepared news," 132, 134 f.; headlines, 136 ff.; radio and, 233 f., 237; censorship of, 253, 258 f.
New York Times, income, 118
Nicholson, S. E., on lobbying, 177
Normal schools, 82
Norris, Rev. J. Frank, noted fundamentalist, 63

O'Connell, Cardinal, denounces Einstein, 72
O'Connor, T. P., on religious conflict, 76
Ogburn, William, on marriage, 56
O'Neill, Eugene, *Desire under the Elms*, 269
Osborn, Henry F., 5
Outlines, short cuts to culture, 247
Owens, Dewey, on comics, 131

Page, Kirby, 60
Palmer, A. Mitchel, the "Red" dragnet, 254
Paranoia, 24; patriotic societies suffer from, 186
Parathyroid glands, 21 f.
Parochial schools, 70; Senator Heflin discusses, 95; attacked by legislation, 251
Parrington, Vernon, *Main Currents in American Thought*, cited, 28; quoted, 30
Patches, patriotic publication, 60
Patriotic societies, propaganda of, 183 ff.
Peace, Kellogg Treaty, 195 f., 257, 258
Pearl, Raymond, 9
Pearson, Karl, 3, 5
Peeping Tom, legislation, 263
Phillips, H. I., on radio advertising, 235

Pineal gland, 21 f.
Pituitary gland, 19 f.
Pius XI, Pope, on education, 70, note; on papal supremacy, 71; on Catholic Church, 72; denounces American movies, 209
Platform, political, 156 f.
Poffenberger, A. T., on movies and morals, 216
Poling, Rev. Daniel, sermons over radio, 229
Political parties, 139-65; Republican and Democratic, 140 ff.; big business and, 143; true function of, 143 f.; reasons for American alignment, 144 f.; Republican and Democratic, as myths, 146 f.; no Labor Party in United States, 150 f.; minor parties, 151 f.; the political machine, 152 ff.; campaign methods, 155 ff.; two-party system, 166
Politicians, the men who "run the machine," 152 ff.; lobbyists and, 173-77; campaign methods, 155 ff.; use of radio, 224 f.
Politics, churches' participation, 73 ff.; influence of Press, 115 ff.; defined, 141; the political machine, 152 ff.
Ponsonby, Arthur, *Falsehood in War Time*, cited, 197
Postmaster-General, censoring power, 261 f.
Primary elections, 153 ff.
Prize fights, on the radio, 224, 235
Prohibition, attitude of Catholics toward, 71; bloc, 166 f.; position of major parties on, 143; as a cause of crime, 180 f.
Propaganda, of public utilities in schools, 90 f., 103; patriotic groups and, 92 f., 183 f.; churches and, 94, 195; dangers of, 95 f., 196 f.; in the news, 132, 134 f.; pressure and, 166-97; definition of, 178; extent of, 178-84; methods, 180 ff.; for public ownership, 182 f.; through publicity, 183, note; 187-89; advertising as, 189 ff.; government bureau of, 197, note; *The Battle Cry of Peace*, 201; in movies, 202 f.; in news reels, 204
Protective tariff, as political issue, 142; legislation on, 168 f.; lobbying and, 178, note; *see also* Great Western Sugar Company
Protestants, 33, 38; reformation and marriage, 48; churches in United States, 58; K.K.K. and, 60; attitude toward Catholics, 67 ff.; active in politics, 73, 158; intolerance of, 248
Publicity agents, 132; subsidized by public utilities, 135; as propagandists, 187 f.; Edward L. Bernays on, 189, note
Public opinion, vii, viii, 1, 28, 31 f.; religious opinion in U. S., 61 f.; influence of schools on, 77, 106, 112; B. Pierce on, 85 f.; influence of Press on, 116 ff.; political parties and, 139 ff.; organized group opinion, 168; influence of rainfall on, 148, note; relation of opinion and information, 149; influence of movies, 198-223; influence of legitimate theater, 211; influence of advertising on, 189-

97; radio and, 223-38; influence of books, 238-47
Public Ownership League, propaganda against, 181 f.; extent of league's propaganda, 182 f.
Public Relations Counsel, 189 and note
Public utilities, 90 f., 103 f.; advertising of, 119; "prepared news" of, 134 f.; control of Press, 135; lobbying methods of, 174; propaganda of, 181 f., 187 ff.; "Edison Smartest Boy Contest," 189, note; *see also* Sheridan, J. B.
Pulitzer, Ralph, denies influence of advertiser on newspaper, 119
Puritans, 29; morals and, 30; sex and, 30; church-state of, 249 f.; *see also* Social heritage

Quick, Herbert, on McGuffey's readers, 241

Race, differences, 4 f., 8, 9; interracial relations and church, 60 f.; as political factor, 145; *The Birth of a Nation*, 201; *see also* Anthropology
Radicals, 139; in major parties, 148; better informed than conservatives, 149
Radio, 223-38; size of industry, 224; in political campaigns, 225 f.; mass education and, 226 f.; quality of entertainment, 227 ff.; preferences of listeners, 229, note; as advertising medium, 233 ff.; cost of, 235; character of audience, 236, note; as a news agency, 237; *see also* Seldes, Gilbert
Railroads, lobbies of, 173 f.
Rainfall, relation to political behavior, 148, note
Randall, John, 12
Rationalization, 25; of individuals in crowds, 40 ff.
Reform groups, and delusions, 38 f.; in the movies, 203 f.
Religion, defined, 57; in America, 61 f.; at N.Y.U., 65 f.; as political issue, 74 f., 145 f.; in the movies, 203; on the radio, 223, 229; religious intolerance, 248 ff.; religious liberty, how far should it go, 250 f.
Remington, F., correspondent, 115
Reporting, a lost art, 132 f.; of executive sessions, 259 f.
Representation, under two-party system, 166 ff.; *Group Representation before Congress*, cited, 168; by groups, 166-73; Herring, quoted on, 187; socialists denied, 256, 257
Republicans, newspapers and, 116, 139; as voting group, 166 ff.; ideals of, 140; states' rights and, 141 f.; protective tariff and, 142; prohibition and, 143; why does party endure, 144 f.; oust insurgents, 147; use of radio, 225
Reynolds, Dr. R. A., 22, note
Roosevelt, Franklin D., use of radio, 224
Roosevelt, Theodore, 34
Ross, Charles A., on pressure of advertiser on Press, 119
Rothafel, S. L. (Roxy), on controversial movies, 204; program of theater, 218

Rousseau, J. J., 2; *Social Contract*, 239
Royal Typewriter Company, broadcasts Tunney-Dempsey fight, 235
"Rum, Romanism, and rebellion," 146
Rural America, political orthodoxy and, 145, 147 f.
Russia, movies produced in, 202; *see also* Kaltenborn, H. V.
Sadie Thompson, 204
"Safety First," movies promote, 206
Saint Paul, on marriage, 48
Sait, E. M., on voter's burden, 144
Salmon, Lucy, on influence of Press, 114
Santayana, George, 45
Schmalhausen, S., 53
School, 77-113; relation to family, 51; cost of, 77; teaching staff in American schools, 78 ff.; sex education in, 80; schools for training of teachers, 82 f.; freedom of expression in, 85-87; control of public schools, 87 ff.; special interests in schools, 88; propaganda in, 90 ff., 179; pacifism in schools of Chicago, 93 f.; curriculum, control of by legislation, 96 ff.; textbooks in, 98 ff.; colleges, 101-13
Schwimmer, Rosika, denied citizenship, 257
Scopes, John Thomas, 63
Seagle, William, bankruptcy of constitutionalism, 255, 263, 264
Sedition, legislation against, 253, 262
Seldes, Gilbert, radio and America, 238
Senate, United States, reporting of executive sessions, 259 f.
September Morn, made famous, 187 f.
Sex, and Puritans, 30; education and, 80; in colleges, 108; in movies, 200, 212; appeal, in advertising, 193; in talkies, 220; censorship and, 264; *see also* Davis, Katherine B., Tabloid
Shakspere, above criticism, 240
Shaw, Bernard, on movies, 198
Shearer, William Baldwin, 171, note
Shelton, Rev. Don, 66, note
Sheridan, J. B., on public utility advertising, 119
Shipley, Maynard, study of religion and science, 64 f.
Siegfried, André, on advertising and newspaper policy, 118
Sin, word used in sermons, 66, note
Sinclair, Upton, *Goose-Step*, cited, 103, 118; *The Jungle*, 243 f.; *Oil*, banned in Boston, 266
Slogans, of the crowd, 41 f.; "rum, Romanism, and rebellion," 146; political, 157 ff.; of advertisers, 193
Smith, Adam, *Wealth of Nations*, 240
Smith, Alfred E., 74; member of same party as Heflin, 147; how described by adherents, 159; replies to Ogden Mills, 160 f.; accused of being pro-negro, 163; publicity for, 188 f.; use of radio, 225

Smith, Charles, arrested for atheism, 251
Smith, Frank, supported by Insull, 143
Smith, J. Allen, *Spirit of American Government*, cited, 45
Smoot, Reed, on cigarette advertising, 194
Social heritage, 28 ff.; (*see* Puritans); political parties and, 144 f.
Socialists, party in United States, 150; case of Victor Berger, 256; ejected from N. Y. assembly, 257
South, religious opinion in, 62, 63; political opinion in, 145 f.
Standardization, of newspapers, 130 f.
Stanley, Dr. L. L., 22, note
Starch, Daniel, study of radio preferences, 229, note
States' rights, as political issue, 141 f.
Stead, W. T., on power of Press, 114
Steffens, Lincoln, *The Shame of the Cities*, 242
Stephenson, Nathaniel W., on historical movies, 207
Stereotypes, 37 ff.; defined, 42 ff.; education and, 44; cure for, 45; in electing school officials, 88; newspapers cater to, 121; political parties and, 166 f.; political, 144 f., 157 ff.; use of, in political campaigns, 186 f.; advertising and, 189 f.; of average man, 190; of college students, 193; Sinclair Lewis creator of, 244; protected by censors, 273
Stimulus and response, 12 ff.
Stoddard, Lothrop, 5
Sumner, John S., anti-vice chief, 264
Sunday, Rev. Billy, 64; on the Germans, 196 f.
Sunday school, 60
Sutherland, E. H., on movies and crime, 212
Swanson, Gloria, in *Sadie Thompson*, 204
Syndicalism, laws against, 254 f.
Syndicates, 130 ff.

Tabloid, newspapers, 125 f.; readers of, 127 f.
Talkies, 219-23
Taming of the Shrew, The, 220 f.
Tammany, how the machine works, 152 f.
Tariff, *see* Protective tariff
Taylor, George S., on political conflict, 141
Teachers, in American schools, 78 f.; salaries of, 78 f., 79, note; women as, 80; and politics, 81, 83; qualifications of, 81; and morals, 83 f.; freedom of expression among, 85-87; case of Abraham Lefkowitz, 86 f.; subsidizing of college teachers, 103-05
Ten Nights in a Bar Room, 240
Textbooks, propaganda in, 90 ff.; uniformity in, 98; character of, 99 f.
Theater, effect of movies on, 210 f.; little theater, 222 f.; censorship of, 269 ff.
Thompson, Mayor William, campaign methods, 161 f.
Thorndike, E. L., 82, note

Thrasher, Frederick, study of Chicago gangs, 54 f.; gang boys' movie heroes, 214
Three Soldiers, 245
Thymus gland, 21
Thyroid gland, 19
Tibbet, Lawrence, in *The Rogue Song*, 221
Tichenor, Frank A., movies and advertising, 208 f.
Toledo, Ohio, movie survey, 212, 214
Trotter, W., 36
Turner, Frederick, *Frontier in American History*, cited, 28
Twain, Mark, 278
Tweed, "Boss," 198

Uncle Tom's Cabin, 240
Union and Times, The (Catholic publication), on Alfred E. Smith, 74 f.

Vanzetti, B., speech to Judge Thayer, 279
Vare, W. S., denounced by party associates, 155
Veblen, Thorstein, *Higher Learning in America*, cited, 102
Villard, O. G., on tabloids, 126
Visher, S., 4

"Wall Street," as a stereotype, 158
War, in fiction, 245
Warner Brothers, present all-talking picture, 219
Washington, George, 34, 35, 240
Washington Times, news policy, 123
Watson, John B., 11, 14 ff., 194; on sex movies, 212
W.C.T.U., 73
Weems, Parson, 240
Wells, H. G., 77, 246
Wharton School, survey of newspaper content, 124 f.
Whipple, Leon, quoted, 248
White, William A., 118, 121; on Frank Munsey, 129
Wiggam, A. E., 4, 9
Wilkinson, James, prosecutes Dennett case, 267 f.
Williams, Arthur, on radio advertising, 233
Williams, Edward H., Detroit school inspector, 81, note
Wilson, P. W., on movies and crime, 212
Wilson, Woodrow, 34, 35; on college alumni, 111
Women, viewed as property, 49 f.; employment of, 52; in teaching profession, 80; representation of, 171 f.
Woodward, Jack, ridicules the radio, 228
Words, acquisition of meaning, 17 f.
World, New York, on party differences, 147; advocates censorship, 269
Woywod, Dr. S., on canon law, 70 f.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
NEW YORK

FOREIGN AGENT
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
HUMPHREY MILFORD
AMEN HOUSE, LONDON, E. C.